The Source of Division, War, and Hate

1. A False Persona of God is a false god

To conquer 'division, war, and hate' in our world, we must first be able to identify or 'see' its source. Consider the following parallel. A root is the part of a tree which is essential for life, keeping it alive, yet we cannot see the root; that is, the root is underground and in the 'unseen' realm. And even if a tree is cut all the way to the ground, with the root still intact, the tree will grow back. So, the only real way to remove a tree is of course to 'unearth the **dirt** (where a root get its nutrients or is **fed**) in order to expose the root so that it can be **seen**, and then cut out and burned'. If we say that 'the **seen** trunk, branches, and leaves of a tree' represents 'the division, war, and hate in our world', then 'the <u>unseen root</u> of a tree' represents 'the SOURCE of division, war, and hate in our world'. And like 'the root of a tree' which is alive and strong because it remains underground and fed by the surrounding dirt, 'the source of division, war, and hate' is also alive and strong because it is 'underground' (i.e., 'hidden from our spiritual eyes') and fed by figurative dirt (i.e., 'lies that we truly believe are truth'); understanding that those who produce this figurative dirt (and their followers) blindly **feed** 'the source', while thinking that they are doing 'what is right, noble, and virtuous'. In other words, because our minds cannot yet identify this 'source' with the knowledge of truth, the multitudes continue to unknowingly support it, thinking that they are doing so in the name of unity and peace. So what is keeping 'the source of division, war, and hate' in the unseen realm, hidden from our minds, so that we cannot identify it? What is keeping 'the root of the tree of division, war, and hate' from being unearthed and exposed so that it may be cut out and burned? Quite simply, we cannot see 'the source of division, war, and hate' because it is hiding **underneath** 'the name of Jesus'. That is, we cannot expose 'the root of the tree of division, war, and hate' because we have yet to 'dig up' the dirt associated with 'the name of Christ'; noting that 'the lies spoken (mainly by our religious leaders) in the name of Christ' = 'the dirt which is covering up the root of our division'. So we must realize that our religious forefathers (particularly Catholic) have 'spoken lies in the name of Christ' for their own glory and supremacy, and these lies are what hide (or cover over, as with dirt) the root of 'why we continue to blindly fight and kill each other'; i.e., the lies spoken in the name of Christ make it impossible for us to see 'the source of our division'. Thus, until Christ returns to unearth the <u>dirt</u> (or *lies*) spoken in His name, essentially **exposing** 'the <u>root</u>', we will not have the <u>sight</u> to be able to <u>identify</u> and then destroy 'the source of division, war, and hate', and consequently, we will not have unity and peace. In other words, the one and only path to true world peace is to 'receive sight from Christ when He returns' in order to then see and destroy 'the source of division, war, and hate' so that we can truly be 'unified as one flock with one Shepherd' (John 10.16, 11.52, & 17.21, and Zechariah 13.9). Furthermore, just as a tree will 'wither and dry up' when the root is unearthed and then exposed to bright sunlight, when Christ - 'the Bright and Morning Star' (Revelation 22.16), or 'Sun of Righteousness' (Malachi 4.2) - returns to unearth the dirt spoken in His name, exposing 'the root of

ultimately 'wither and dry up' so that it may be cut out and burned forever. Here it is important to understand that the word 'apocalypse' means 'a revealing of hidden knowledge'; understanding that 'The Book of Revelation' does not really reveal any knowledge, as it is 'what is written in code' with hidden meanings, making 'The Book of Revelation' somewhat of a misnomer which should have been named 'The Book of Hidden Knowledge'. So the apocalypse is 'a revealing of knowledge, by Christ Himself, concerning biblical information - such as 'The Book of Revelation', among many other key pieces of Scripture - that has been hidden in plain sight for thousands of years'. And it is this knowledge of Christ (or His brightness), which will be revealed upon His 2nd coming (see also 1 Peter 4.13 and 5.1), that will shine on 'the root of our division', making it wither, dry up, and die so that we may burn 'the tree of division, war, and hate', thereby finally realizing true world peace, and consequently true happiness.

In short, Christ's knowledge of the truth will expose the *lies* spoken in His name by our religious forefathers, thereby also exposing 'the source of division, war, and hate'. So without this 'revelation of knowledge' (i.e., apocalypse) to correct the lies and error that we have inherited, we will never attain peace and happiness. In other words, peace cannot be attained without correction of the lies and error that we have inherited from our blind religious forefathers, who, due to their blindness, wholeheartedly believed that they were passing on the truth. As Jeremiah 16.19 says, "Surely our fathers have inherited lies"... and then blindly passed them on to us. When we inherit a lie - i.e., when we are 'born into a lie' - we blindly accept it as being the truth so that we wholeheartedly grow up believing that we follow the truth, while the entire time it was just 'a beautifully disguised lie'; noting that this 'spiritual blindness' is the same spiritual blindness of Adam and Eve, as well as people such as the Pharisees of Jesus' day. Therefore, as noted in the Pharisees' disbelief of Jesus' words of truth (due of course to their inherited lies), an inherited lie is the most powerful of strongholds in the human mind, of course recognizing that it is all a person has known from the time of their childhood (i.e., from the teachings of parents and supposed theological scholars). And so, as the inherited lies passed down to us from our religious forefathers represent the most powerful strongholds of religious <u>division</u> and unknowing religious bigotry, we must come to the understanding that it is 'our blind acceptance of inherited lies as being the truth of God and/or Jesus' that is ultimately responsible for the <u>blind construction</u> of <u>walls</u> and <u>barriers</u> (<u>not bridges</u>) between varying groups, peoples, and nations; noting that the Pope is 'a <u>blind</u> wall builder', <u>not</u> 'a bridge builder', as the name 'Roman <u>Pontiff</u>' misleadingly implies. And because 'the source of division, war, and hate' is the greatest of all our inherited lies, it represents the CORNErSTONE of a 'wall of lies' that looms over humanity, keeping it in constant darkness. Thus again, in order to have true world peace or 'rest', we must not 'harden our **hearts**' to the voice of God and His Servant (Hebrews 4.3-10); noting that many people's hearts, due to man-made traditions, are already unknowingly hardened to the true voice of God, unfortunately making it nearly impossible for them to Change. Therefore, when Christ returns and we are given His 'revelation of knowledge', we must '<u>un-harden</u> our hearts' and <u>accept His correction</u> (see Psalm 2.10&12) of the *lies* and *error* that we have <u>inherited</u> from our <u>religious forefathers</u> in order to then

bring down the 'wall of lies' that keeps us blindly fighting and killing each other in the dark, thereby ultimately attaining world peace. Using another parallel to trees and bushes, just as the woody hardened part of a shrub must be cut back all the way to the ground to bring up tender new shoots, the hardened hearts of our leaders (particularly our religious leaders) must also be cut back all the way to the ground by the correction of Christ, yielding to the Prince of Peace, in order to make their hearts tender again, and so that we may finally have true world peace. As Psalm 2.10&12 says "Now therefore, be wise, O kings; be instructed, you judges of the earth. Receive instruction from the Son, lest He be angry, and you perish in the way when His wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are those who put their trust in Him."

The <u>best lies</u> are 'the ones where <u>we do not even realize</u> that we have been lied to'. That is, we are content with a lie because we have been raised to believe that it is the truth; realizing that 'the best lies stand side-by-side with the truth'. So one of the most important concepts to understand is that 'we accept and are content with our inherited lies because they are spoken in the names of God and/or Jesus (i.e., the Truth)'; that is, we easily believe and are content with inherited lies because they are passed down to us as something that is holy and divine (when in actuality they are quite unholy and defiled). And <u>Satan</u>, the most *wicked* and *sadistic* of all demons, who knows no boundaries, has craftily chosen 'the name of Jesus' as the most inconspicuous place to hide his best lie ever (i.e., 'the source of division, war, and hate'); which in fact is responsible for unfathomable bloodshed over the last two millennia. So, if you think that Satan is **somehow forbidden** to use 'the name of Jesus' for evil, then you have greatly <u>underestimated</u> this ancient demon. Satan is well aware that he has 'the <u>worst name</u> of all time', therefore we can easily deduce that Satan is surely smart enough to use 'the names of others' to get people to unknowingly follow him. Think about it. If you were Satan, 'the Wolf', wouldn't you identify yourself as Jesus in order to disguise yourself as 'the Lamb', thereby easily deceiving people? It helps here to think of Satan as 'the evil twin of Jesus'; understanding that, as Jesus and Satan are brothers (see Section 18) but not twins, we can recognize parallels in our own lives where we have confused two brothers, say 'on a telephone', thinking 'one was the other', as both (being raised in the same 'house') use the same words and sound a lot alike. But, as much as two brothers may sound alike, we know that many brothers can be polar opposites. Therefore, Jesus and Satan are also two brothers who are polar opposites (Satan being the persona of the Antichrist or 'Opposite Christ'), with Satan taking advantage of the fact that he can **Sound** just like Jesus when speaking to us from the <u>unseen</u> realm; which we can recognize as being similar to 'speaking to the wrong brother on the telephone', as with telephones, you can't see who you are talking to. Hence, by assuming 'the name of Jesus', sounding like Jesus, and using the same words as Jesus, Satan is able to 'disquise himself as Jesus to us in the unseen realm' in order to then speak lies in Jesus' name (so that we do not even realize we have been lied to), thereby secretly training us to perceive 'the persona of Satan' as actually being 'the persona or identity of Jesus'; which ultimately tricks us into unknowingly exalting the personality traits of Satan, making us as a society or culture <u>unknowingly</u> become *more* and *more* <u>like Satan</u>, blindly following his will, all while thinking that it is the will of Jesus, and consequently God.

And so we must realize that Satan is the first and original identity thief, 'assuming names of the good (i.e., Jesus) and assigning to them what is evil in order to fool or trick people with names' (Philip 54,18-31). By assuming names - not only the names of Jesus and God, but any name perceived as being righteous and good - Satan is able to make 'his evil personality traits' appear as being 'God-like personality traits', thereby making us blindly institute Satan's laws, while thinking they are God's laws. That is, by repeatedly identifying himself as Jesus (or as 'any other good name of righteousness') we easily believe Satan's lies (i.e., inherited lies) as being the truth of Christ, and we are then fooled into blindly following Satan's hidden agenda, all while thinking it is Jesus' agenda; of course allowing Satan to secretly advance his evil and hidden agenda without even being detected, and without us even knowing it. Hence, we must realize that Names are utterly deceiving, and that Satan (which includes his blind ministers that he gets to do his will) fools, tricks, and deceives people by 'stealing names (i.e., identity **theft**) of the good (i.e., God, Jesus, the Apostles, Mary, etc.), and then speaking lies **from behind** those <u>names'</u>; remembering that we will openly and willingly accept inherited lies as 'divine truth' when they are spoken from behind the names of God and Jesus. Basically, just as corrupt politicians and businessmen associate themselves with a trusted name (usually in the past) in order to get people to trust and follow their corrupt ways, Satan and his ministers associate themselves with 'the righteousness of Jesus, God, or any other trusted name in the Bible' so that we follow him (i.e., Satan), thinking that it is 'the path of **righteousness'**, when it is actually 'the well <u>disquised</u> path to **corruption** and **hell**'. And by associating himself with the righteousness of Jesus and God, Satan can A) attach his lies to the truth of God, B) correlate his nonsense with the wisdom of God, and C) make CONNECTIONS that never existed, relating 'various people's un-relatable lives and doctrine' to 'Christ's life and doctrine', thereby making us believe lies, nonsense, and worthless legends about false prophets such as Catholic Saints... with all of these 'products of association' (i.e., A, B, & C) making us blindly abide by a false version of righteousness. So by assuming the names of Jesus and God (i.e., stealing Their identities), and associating himself with 'all that is righteous', Satan is able to redefine or rename 'what is evil' as 'something that is good', thereby making us **blindly** follow him and his **false version** of righteousness. Again, the <u>best deceptions</u> are 'the ones where we do not even realize that we have been deceived'.

Additionally, Satan <u>progressively</u> makes his 'false righteousness' seem 'more righteous' from one generation to the next through <u>normalization</u>; i.e., Satan makes his warped, abnormal agenda seem more and more <u>normal</u> as it is passed down through the generations. 'Normalization' occurs <u>slowly</u> over many centuries so that it is <u>hard to perceive by any one generation</u>. I.e., if you lived in the time of your ancient ancestors, then you may perceive something as being abnormal that today's world actually perceives as being normal. In other words, lies we have <u>inherited</u> that seem very normal to us, seemed quite abnormal sometime in the distant past. And so by <u>identifying</u> himself <u>as Jesus</u> - and thus tricking people into believing that his false doctrine actually came from Jesus - Satan is able to, from one generation to the next, <u>Slowly and progressively redefine 'our perception of good and evil'</u>, making 'what is truly good' seem abnormal, and 'what is truly evil' seem normal. I.e., Satan <u>progressively</u> 'normalizes evil' from <u>one generation to the next</u>. Therefore we must understand that over the

course of 2 millennia, attributes of the true identity of Jesus have been made abnormal, as Satan has 'taught us' that those attributes are actually 'of Satan's persona'. Likewise, attributes of the true identity of Satan have been made normal, as Satan has 'taught us' that those attributes are actually 'of Jesus' persona'. So through 'identity theft, association with names of righteousness and righteousness itself, and the subsequent normalization of evil', Satan has slowly, progressively, and methodically, over the last 2000 years, secretly trained us to identify 'many personality traits of the real Jesus' as being 'personality traits of Satan', thereby systematically **rewriting** the true persona of Christ. Thus, when the real Jesus returns, we will instantly label Him as 'the Antichrist' because Satan has convinced us that 'the persona of the <u>real</u> Jesus' is actually 'the persona of Satan'. If you think this is impossible, then consider that this is the same exact method of 'identity swapping' that Satan used to CONVINCE Jesus' own people to crucify Him 2000 years ago; recalling that many of the religious leaders (essentially calling Jesus 'a Satan worshiper') believed that 'Jesus was a disciple of Beelzebub (i.e., Satan)' (Matthew 12.24), and that 'Jesus was possessed by demons and had an unclean spirit' (John 8.48 and Mark 3.30). Therefore, we should not think that Satan's deceptive abilities cannot make the religious leaders of today believe 'the exact same thing that the religious leaders thought 2000 years ago'; making us realize that, since our religious leaders have taught us to 'love the inherited lies that they teach', we will unknowingly hate Christ when He returns, as His truth will oppose 'all the lies that we <u>love</u>', being blindly born into them. So, ultimately we must come to understand that Satan's deceptions know no boundaries, and he has stolen the name and identity of Christ, thereby rewriting Jesus' identity with his own identity (i.e., he has 'swapped identities'), and hence has deceptively spoken from behind the names of Jesus and God to warp our 'sense of right and wrong' (Isaiah 5.20); which of course warps our 'sense of who Jesus and God really are', or 'Their true personas'. And by speaking lies in the names of Jesus and God, thereby warping Their true personas, Satan has tricked us into blindly fighting and killing each other over absolutely nothing at all, causing senseless and unimaginable 'division, war, and hate' (i.e., desolation) among men for the last 2 millennia.

After recognizing that Satan **deceives** by speaking lies in the names of Jesus and God, we can begin to see that, if Satan (disguised as Jesus and/or God) **defines** himself **differently** to different people, he essentially creates many **different versions** of Jesus and God; none of which are 'the <u>true</u> version'. And once many different people <u>believe</u> that they (*individually* or as a *group*) are following 'the <u>true</u> version of Jesus and/or God', while <u>everyone else</u> is following 'a <u>false</u> version', we can easily see the <u>beginnings</u> of *division*, which eventually leads to war and hate. So, while in the past, Satan may have created a persona, and given that persona 'the <u>name</u> of a false god', such as <u>Baal</u>, we must realize that it is much more effective (in terms of trickery and deceit) to simply <u>change</u> the persona of God, thereby effectively creating 'a false version of God' that <u>still goes by the name 'God'</u> with a capital 'G'. In other words, we must realize that '<u>a false persona of God</u> is a false god'. Likewise, 'a false persona of Jesus is a false Jesus'; recognizing that, if enough people (as in members of a cult or a religion) believe in 'the <u>same</u> false persona of Jesus or God', then we can refer to that false persona by 'the name of

their cult or religion'. And Satan has attempted to destroy humanity (which includes all of creation, such as animals, forests, rivers, etc.) by 'speaking lies in the names of Jesus and God', thereby creating 'many different false personas of Jesus and God' (i.e., many different religions), which ultimately makes people of different religions 'divide, fight, and kill with the intent of defending Jesus and/or God', when in actuality they are blindly defending one of Satan's beautifully disguised 'false personas of Jesus and/or God'; remembering of course that 'a false persona of God is a false god'. Thus, Satan's main objective of 'making humanity blindly destroy itself through senseless division, war, and hate', is accomplished by the creation of 'many false personas of Jesus and God' (i.e., many false gods) that people follow, truly believing that they are following the one and only Jesus and/or God, when in reality it is just Satan in disguise.

And so we must face the reality that, if Satan has created 'many false versions of Jesus', then the world that we live in today has never known 'the true persona of Jesus', and consequently - as 'Jesus is the express image of the invisible God' (see Hebrews 1.3 and Colossians 1.15) - does not know the one true <u>God</u>. That is, 'the Jesus that we have inherited' is **not** the **real** Jesus, but rather a <u>fictitious</u> Jesus that never actually existed, but is 'kept alive' by the lies that we have inherited (i.e., inherited lies) from 'our religious forefathers and their present-day descendants who propagate those lies'; noting that our religious leaders keep this 'false, fictitious Jesus' alive because he ('the fictitious Jesus that is really Satan in disquise') grants them unrighteous authority, glory, supremacy, control, and power over the multitudes. The fact is that 'the fictitious Jesus we have inherited' is a mangled version (based on gross misinterpretations) of the few words written by others about Jesus (noting that Jesus did not write those words). Our *fictitious Jesus* is a <u>distorted version</u> of a Man's life based on <u>fragments</u> scraped together to form 'what we (namely our religious leaders) think Jesus' identity should be'. But when 'the real Jesus' is revealed (see Luke 17.30) - understanding that Revelation 19.12 says 'No one knew the <u>name</u> of the Christ, except Christ Himself', implying that <u>Jesus is already here</u>, physically walking among us, and we don't even know it - He will unite humanity with a simplicity we did not think possible, as Jesus will destroy all of the false personas of Himself that divide humanity; false personas that have been created by our religious leaders who, because of their 'lust for control and power', are blindly and unknowingly led by **Satan**. And so when the real Jesus is <u>revealed</u>, He will put to **shame** all of the religious leaders who proudly declare that 'they know His true persona or identity'. That is, the real Jesus will put all of the world's religious leaders to shame for proudly asserting that 'We know Him', when in fact they have never met Him, and could not recognize Him even if He was standing right in front of them; remembering that Jesus has already said 'When I return, I will declare, to those speaking (or prophesying) in My name and claiming to perform wonders in My name, that 'I never knew **YOU**, depart from Me, you who practice lawlessness" (Matthew 7.22-23).

As Revelation 12.9 says 'Satan deceives the whole world', and Jesus Himself says that 'Prior to My return, false christs and false prophets will show great signs and perform wonders to deceive even the elect' (Matthew 24.24). And Satan is able to 'deceive the entire world' by of course speaking lies from behind the names of Jesus and God; realizing that these lies, which are propagated by our blind

religious leaders who believe that they are **truly** conversing with Jesus or God, are what create the **many** false gods that still (confusingly) go by the names of 'capital G' 'God', and 'capital C' 'Christ', with these many false gods allowing Satan to easily deceive humanity as a whole... and we never even knew it. Think about it. Most people on earth say that 'they worship one God', but what they don't understand is that, **if** the **persona of God** and/or **Jesus** has been **changed over time**, then **they are really worshiping a false god**. In other words, they are really worshiping 'the persona of men' who have changed 'the persona of God' to be like themselves, thereby practicing 'the worship of man' (which is ultimately 'the worship of Satan') disguised as 'the worship of God'. So again, by changing the true persona of God, we are really worshiping a false persona of God, and thereby worshiping a false god... and we never even knew it! Remember, the best deceptions are 'the ones where we do not even realize that we have been deceived'. Consider the following. If all of us believe that each and every one of our respective religions represent the one true God - i.e., we believe that the religion which we belong to <u>describes</u> God's true persona - can even the most spiritually blind individual therefore not recognize that the possibility of many different personas of God exists (i.e., many different religions = many different personas of God), and consequently that 'the persona of God the blind person is following' could **possibly not** be the **true** persona of God, making the blind person unknowingly worship a false god (i.e., Satan)? That is, if we can recognize that **other** religions are following a false god (i.e., a false persona of God), is it not possible that we too, 'having a plank in our eye that we think is a speck', are blindly and unknowingly following a false god, which we think is the one true God? And so most people on earth are unknowingly practicing idolatry by worshiping a false god (i.e., their religion), which has been created by men who have 'changed the persona or identity of the one true God to be more like themselves', thereby ultimately meaning that most people on earth are unknowingly WOrshipping Satan (see Revelation 13.3&4). I.e., 'most people on earth have been deceived by Satan' (Revelation 12.9), and are unknowingly practicing idolatry, as they have unknowingly followed one of Satan's 'many false personas of Jesus and/or God'. Thus, we must come to realize that Satan, 'the current ruler of this world' (John 12.31), has **hidden** the identity of 'the true Jesus', replacing it with his own identity through gross biblical misinterpretations, thereby easily deceiving the multitudes in the name of Christ; remembering that 'names are utterly deceiving'. So when 'the true persona of Jesus' is revealed upon His 2nd coming, Satan will be overthrown and cast into hell (or 'destroyed', see Hebrews 2.14) for 'stealing the names of God and Jesus, speaking lies in Their names, and thus causing unfathomable desolation over countless generations', through of course the creation of 'many different false personas of Jesus and God' (which are false gods).

To understand **how** any of this is <u>possible</u> - i.e., how the whole world can be <u>unknowingly deceived</u> by Satan with 'the <u>use</u> of the names of Jesus and God' - we must recognize that <u>we do not know the basics</u> or <u>fundamentals</u>. And we - just as the people in Jeremiah 16.10 said '<u>What</u> is our iniquity' - are essentially <u>clueless</u> as to our <u>true sins</u>. So we must recognize 'we are mere <u>babes</u> who are in need of <u>spiritual milk</u>, not yet able to eat solid spiritual food'. We must recognize that our house is falling apart,

and we blindly ignore that it is because the **foundation** is crumbling to pieces, as it is built on sand (i.e., 'the false, **ever**-changing doctrine of **men** and **Satan**') that continually **undermines** and **shifts** (just as 'the ever-changing word of Satan'), when it should have been built on rock (i.e., 'the true neverchanging word of God'). We must recognize that, just as Josiah, when trying to repair the *literal* house of God, blew the dust off of 'The Book of the Law' only to realize that the figurative house of God was in ruin - as they were worshiping other gods (i.e., Baal and Asherah in 2 Kings 23.4) in the literal house of God - our 'figurative house of God' is also in ruin, as we too are blindly worshiping false personas of God (i.e., false gods) in our literal houses of God; making them 'houses of Satan' in reality. Therefore we must recognize that, just as 'Josiah, all of his supposedly knowledgeable priests and prophets, and the whole multitude of people under them' had blindly transgressed the Commandments of God that were right in front of them the whole time (see 2 Kings chapters 22 and 23), we too have blindly transgressed the Commandments of God, and we have done so in a time when essentially everyone in the world has access to a Bible containing those Commandments. I.e., contrary to the time of Josiah (and up to the time up to the **Protestant Reformation**), in this present time (i.e., 2016), the Commandments are in plain sight for all to see, having been translated into every language, with most people being literate enough to read them. As Jesus said 2000 years ago, the same applies today, 'Moses gave you the Commandments, yet none of you keeps the Commandments' (John 7.19). So it is essential that we 'blow the dust off of our Bibles' so that we may (just as Josiah did 2600 years ago; see 2 Kings 22.19) 'tear our clothes, weep, and humble ourselves', knowing that we have blindly repeated 'the sins of our forefathers', proudly, arrogantly, and boldly transgressing God's Commandments that He has placed right in front of our faces.

Over a period of 3500 years we have divided Moses' Law into 'Ten Commandments', yet if you read Exodus 20.1-7, you will see that the $\underline{\mathbf{1}^{st}}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{Primary Commandment}}$ is really a 3 part Commandment, encompassing our traditional ' $\underline{\mathbf{1}^{st}}$ and $\underline{\mathbf{2}^{nd}}$ Commandments'. Hence, breaking <u>any one</u> of the 3 parts is idolatry. The 3 parts of God's Primary Commandment are as follows.

<u>Part 1</u>: 'I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt; out of <u>bondage</u> and slavery. You shall have **no other gods** before Me'.

Part 2: 'You shall not make, serve, or bow down to a carved image; which includes any likeness of anything in heaven (i.e., Jesus, Mary, etc.) or on earth. I am a jealous God, visiting future generations of those who hate Me.' Note here that idolatry causes one group of people to hate another group of people, which, as God is within others, ultimately equates to 'unknowingly hating the God that you thought you were worshipping'.

<u>Part 3</u>: 'You shall <u>not</u> take the <u>name</u> of <u>God</u> in <u>vain</u>, for those vainly taking God's name (and <u>speaking falsely</u> on His behalf) will be held <u>quilty</u>'.

Part 3, 'taking God's name in vain', is the most deceptively overlooked and misunderstood of the three. To 'take God's name in vain' essentially means to use the name 'capital G' 'God' (i.e., the Lord

your God, who brought you out of Egypt) and assign to that name a false persona, with that false persona becoming 'a false god before God'. To 'take God's name in vain' means to 'proudly speak lies (i.e., dirt) in the name of God (or Jesus, or any other true Prophet of God)', essentially 'putting words in God's mouth' that He never said. To take (or steal, as in identity theft) God's name, and then vainly speak falsely (whether knowingly or unknowingly) on His behalf, you change God's true persona to be more like **yourself**, thereby effectively making 'you and your beliefs' 'a false idol (i.e., a false representative of God's true persona) and a false god' (respectively) before the one true God; noting here that 'breaking Part 3 of the 1st Commandment' essentially breaks Parts 1 and 2 at the same time. So by making 'you and your beliefs' 'a false idol and a false god', you are essentially 'playing God' or 'wanting to be supreme like God to others' (realizing that 'practicing unrighteous supremacy over others' is Satan's **redefined** 'Satan-like version of God') in order to **control** and **enslave** others to yourself. Thus idolatry, 'the creation and worship of false gods and false idols', can be summed up in one word: **'supremacy'**, as it is the people 'taking God's name in vain and speaking falsely on behalf of God' who (by actually acting as a false idol themselves) set-up false idols and false gods, thereby making it those same people (i.e., false prophets and false teachers) who dictate 'what the idols and gods Say and Want', which coincidentally puts these false prophets and false teachers in a man-made place of authority and SUPTEMACY, with all those bowing to the wishes of false prophets and false teachers <u>also</u> enjoying (on some level) the **benefits** and **prosperity** of that **man-made** <u>authority</u> and supremacy. Note that, if you don't think this is true, then consider that people who openly oppose the *majority religion* of their surroundings usually will **not advance** to a high level position in government or large corporations. It is also important to understand that idolatry is always disguised by men as 'you are not bowing to me, rather you are bowing to God (or a god in the Old Testament)'. That is, religious leaders always insist that 'you are showing up to worship God', but it is really 'the worship of man' (i.e., the worship of 'a religious leader's persona of God', which just happens to <u>resemble</u> 'the persona of the religious leader'); noting that the <u>true worship</u> (or honoring) of God is 'simply loving others as yourself', as 'to love and honor others' is 'to love and honor God'. And if you don't think that religion is 'the worship of man' disguised as 'the worship of God', then consider that, whether they actually speak the words, or just **imply** it, the religious leaders project the **certainty** that 'you need us to be saved, so there is no salvation without religious leaders'; i.e., 'no salvation without the **Catholic hierarchy**', 'no salvation without the **Islamic hierarchy**', etc., basically <u>equates</u> to 'the worship of man'.

Hence <u>idolatry</u> - which is really 'the worship of man, and ultimately Satan' <u>disguised as</u> 'the worship of God or a god' - represents '<u>man's desire</u>, on varying levels, to be <u>supreme like God'</u> (i.e., how man <u>perceives</u> God's supremacy to be), having <u>authority</u> over others just as God has <u>supreme authority</u>, and wanting people to <u>bow to</u> you and <u>serve</u> you <u>as if</u> you are God. And idolatry <u>Starts</u> with <u>religious</u> <u>leaders</u> 'taking God's name in vain, and speaking and <u>swearing falsely</u> on His behalf', with this inherent <u>control</u> and <u>power</u> over people <u>trickling down</u> to various <u>governmental leaders</u>, <u>corporate leaders</u>, <u>judges</u>, etc., who bow to the wishes of the religious leaders. Note here that this is why Jesus says to

'Beware of the religious leader's <u>leaven</u>' (Matthew 16.6), as their <u>doctrine</u> 'puffed people up with pride' - just as a <u>leavening agent</u> (i.e., yeast) does to bread - thereby producing <u>followers</u> with a <u>supreme</u> <u>mindset</u>. Therefore, idolatry can be described by the following points.

- Idolatry represents 'man's <u>coveting</u> of spiritual, monetary, emotional, mental, or physical <u>supremacy</u> (or <u>dominance</u>) over others'; noting that, if you would <u>not</u> want to <u>switch places</u> with the person you are in charge of (which is the <u>essence</u> of 'love your neighbor <u>as yourself</u>'), then you are most likely practicing <u>supremacy</u> (<u>not equality</u>), and ultimately <u>idolatry</u>.
- Idolatry remembering that Part 1 of the 1st Commandment pertains to 'the Israelites being enslaved in Egypt' - quite simply represents, on some level, the desire to have slaves and **servants**; although we have learned to not use this **outwardly** negative language in order to keep our 'normalized slavery' hidden, as if it doesn't even exist. And 'slave owners' usually keep their *normalized slavery* <u>hidden</u> by 'keeping people <u>ignorant</u> in some way'; that is, 'they **hide** knowledge so they can **hide** their **slavery**'. And this manipulating and keeping knowledge hidden is many times practiced by 'white collar' workers who can more easily enslave 'blue collar' workers (who are usually less educated). Note also that this normalized slavery has been obscured by places like the United States, as it is a 'free' nation, yet be assured that 'the rich' still have slaves; those slaves are now just 'free' to move from one slave owner to the next. And so 'man's desire to own and rule over other men' (which slowly, day by day, surely destroys people from the inside over the course of 40, 50, or 60 years or more of being enslaved) is still very much alive and being practiced right under our noses; it is just harder to <u>pin</u> on <u>any **one** person</u> in a 'free' nation, as slave owners will <u>innocently</u> claim 'You can go anywhere and do anything you want', knowing that there is a 'carbon copy slave owner' in the next town... and the next, and the next, and so on. Realize here that this 'hidden caste system' is especially hard to pin on any one person when it hides behind the corporate veil (i.e., many men in charge, yet **no one** is in charge). Additionally, we must understand that, in places like the United States and other 'free' nations we have essentially transcended 'the idea that slavery is based on color, race, or ethnicity' so that anyone who has enough money can be a slave owner; again keeping our slavery hidden.
- Idolatry represents the **exploiting** of **anything** and **everything** for **personal gain**, **greedily** taking **any** and **all natural resources** (i.e. **land**, **rivers**, **lakes**, **animals**, **timber**, **mining goods**, **people**, **etc.**) and then **abusing** them to the **highest degree**; of course saying the whole time **'It's just business**, **don't take it personally'**. And they do all this while making for themselves **laws** that justify and even glorify what they do as **'progress**, **helping humanity to grow**, **gainfully employing**, and **building communities'**, when all they are really doing is **'taking** from humanity' and **'making communities** (i.e. **slave camps**) that are built ultimately to serve them as their **unknowing slaves'**. Think here of how a **corporation** (which would never have

been established without at least a <u>perceived association</u> with an <u>accepted religion</u> of its surroundings) will <u>buy up</u> all of the <u>land</u>, <u>strip</u> the land of <u>timber</u> and <u>minerals</u> (while of course saying that they are <u>sustainably developina</u>), <u>strip</u> the surrounding people of their <u>time</u> and <u>labor</u>, and <u>pollute</u> the <u>water source</u>, then have us '<u>buying back</u> from them (off of the <u>little</u> <u>money</u> that they gave us for labor compensation) all of their goods' and '<u>paying to fix</u> (or purify) the <u>water source</u> that <u>they broke</u>'; ultimately realizing that the people would have been better off if the corporation was <u>never there to begin with</u>, as people could <u>use</u> (<u>not abuse</u>) the land to have their own <u>food</u>, <u>water</u>, <u>and shelter</u>, all while <u>not</u> being <u>enslaved</u> to the <u>corporation</u>, being able to therefore <u>enjoy the <u>natural</u> world around them that the corporation (or <u>multiple</u> corporations, including religious corporations, such as <u>Catholicism</u>, which is probably '<u>the oldest</u> <u>corporation</u>') Stole from them.</u>

- Idolatry represents the mentality of 'How can I get this person to labor for (i.e., in place of)

 me?'; which is practiced by people who (by making 'Iying' their craft or art form) are always

 scheming ways of manipulating others for personal gain and superiority. To further understand
 this idea of 'tricking others into laboring for you', consider here the micro-level parallel between
 'a father and his children' where 'God = the father' and 'we = the children'. Think of how sibling

 A will say to sibling B 'Dad said to do this', only to get sibling B to do something that sibling A

 did not want to do. So by this example, we can easily see how the idolatry of breaking God's

 Primary Commandment, saying 'God said to do this', creates 'the normalized, hidden, and

 supposedly righteous enslavement of others' that is wrongly thought to be the will of God (i.e.,
 the father in this parallel). And sadly, people who labor tirelessly for their 'normalized slave

 owners', positively embrace, and are even thankful for the enslavement practices of their
 captor... all because they think that they are doing so for God, and at His command.
- Idolatry represents an <u>Obsession</u> with being 'the guy in charge' (or 'the <u>center</u> of attention'), acting as if you are 'the <u>king</u>' with 'royal subjects' bowing to you and your every word as if they are 'precious nuggets of wisdom'. Realize here that many 'kings and lords' (i.e., CEOs, bishops, etc.) will <u>confuse</u> people by <u>giving away food, clothing, cars, etc.</u>, playing the role of <u>benevolent dictator</u>, yet once their authority and supremacy is tested or threatened, they are quick to remind their 'royal subjects' 'who is <u>slave</u>' and 'who is <u>master</u>', thereby ultimately <u>proving</u> and <u>showing</u> themselves to be 'dictators whose only intention is to have people indebted to them as their personal slaves' (that is, they only want 'slaves of indebtedness').

 Consider here how, just as a <u>slave owner</u> in the <u>southern</u> United States would say 'Look, I take Care of my black slaves', giving them food, clothing, and shelter, and acting <u>as if</u> they are somehow <u>virtuous</u>, today's <u>hidden slave owners</u>, after creating a multitude of slaves, <u>also</u> act and 'outwardly appear' (see Matthew 23.28) as though they are <u>virtuous</u> to take care of them by giving them food, clothing, housing, cars, 'blessings', etc. But again, these <u>modern-day</u> hidden slave owners will act just like 'a slave owner in the southern United States of the 1800s' if

their *authority* and *supremacy* is **tested**, as their *'benevolence'* will <u>cease</u>, and they will <u>justify</u> the <u>beating</u> (whether *spiritual* or *physical*) and <u>oppression</u> of their slaves in order to *'keep them in line and in their place'*; of course revealing that *'on the inside'* they are actually *'lawless dictators'*. Note here that, by this example of the *southern slave owner*, we can <u>clearly</u> see how *'those who <u>cause the poverty of others'</u> are <u>often</u> the ones saying <i>'Look how charitable I am to the poor'*.

- Idolatry represents 'the <u>blind ambition</u> to have <u>more</u> and <u>more</u>' think of the mentality of 'you can <u>never</u> have enough' so that people have to <u>come to you</u>, bowing down to you as you <u>dole</u> <u>out small portions</u> to them, with them staying <u>indebted</u> and <u>enslaved</u> to you (as 'slaves of indebtedness'), never having true freedom. Note here that this is <u>not</u> to be confused with 'the <u>ambition</u> to <u>make yourself better</u> and <u>better</u>, doing better (i.e., smarter) work, and becoming more and more skilled and knowledgeable'.
- Idolatry represents an **obsession** on some level, whether small or great with **control** and power, which is ultimately an obsession with MONEY. Here it must be understood that many religious leaders (such as the Catholic hierarchy) are seen as taking a vow of poverty, which in most cases is misleading, as they have left behind the worry and anxiety of the common man's burden of paying for a house and food, which consumes many people, keeping them working like <u>slaves</u> their whole life without near the <u>recognition</u> of 'a <u>supposedly</u> poor religious leader'; noting here that, by having spiritual and emotional control over people's minds and consciences, religious leaders can easily extort (i.e., steal) money, time, labor, respect, etc. from the masses 'in the name of God and spreading the Good News' (Matthew 23.25). In this regard, our religious leaders have tricked the common working man into actually 'working in place of' the religious leader, being an *indebted slave* for the religious leader's supposedly necessary divine connection to God. Or as Jesus says 'The religious leaders are all talk and no do, with their works (i.e., supposedly necessary <u>prayers</u> and <u>rituals</u> that do <u>not</u> equate to <u>real work</u> at all) being merely a **show** which they use to get others to <u>labor for</u> (in place of) <u>them</u>, not even <u>liftina</u> a finger to move what is actually their own workload' (Matthew 23.3-5). Additionally, it helps to think of this 'showing' and false vow of poverty as the same mentality of 'sleeping in a <u>cardboard box</u> that someone has placed inside of a <u>mansion</u>', then having them falsely say 'See, look, I live in a cardboard box... in poverty'. Think about it. To know that 'you will never be in <u>need</u> of any of the basic necessities for the rest of your life' is more than most people will ever have, and is nowhere near poverty; which can be paralleled to a corporation (who has mastered 'money manipulation') that says 'We don't make a profit... after we pay for everything we want (such as cars, planes, etc.)'. So the vow of poverty of many religious leaders is false and bogus, as they don't live in true poverty, always being guaranteed food and shelter, with that guarantee existing because they, or more accurately, their forefathers were **obsessed** with money, and **extorting** money from the multitudes in the name of God in order to secure *control*, *power*, and ultimately *willing* slaves. As a side note, it should be mentioned that

the <u>extortion</u> practices of the religious leaders in 'our <u>present form</u> of <u>tithing</u>' is <u>not</u> really <u>equitable</u> to 'the idea of <u>biblical tithing</u>', as we now have '<u>separation</u> of church and state', and so are essentially <u>already tithing 3 times over</u> by paying <u>½ in taxes</u>, with the religious leaders then <u>claiming</u> that 'God wants an <u>extra 10%</u> on top of that'; which is <u>not true</u>. The truth is that, by '<u>separating</u> church and state', we have been tricked into '<u>double tithing</u>', paying taxes (which are usually <u>squandered</u>) to the state for 'the <u>common good</u> and <u>welfare</u>' (which was the <u>original purpose</u> of <u>tithing</u>), then paying a <u>2nd tax</u> incurred by the religious leaders 'in the name of God'; which is ultimately a <u>tax</u> to support their <u>false god</u> (i.e., their 'false belief system' or 'religion'), thereby <u>perpetuating</u> the supremacy that is ultimately killing us. This makes it clear that 'religious tithing in <u>today's</u> world' is ultimately being used for 'the <u>destruction</u> of humanity', <u>not</u> 'the <u>common good</u> and <u>welfare</u> of humanity'.

And so while some of the greatest *idolaters* or 'slave owners' (i.e., the Catholic Pope) appear to be 'humble, living in poverty, and working towards peace and harmony as a (false) servant of the people'of course by feeding and clothing (via 'extorted tithes') potential 'slaves of indebtedness' who will then pledge their allegiance to the religious leader's false god - idolaters can still be identified by their lust for authority and supremacy, which is easily recognized when their authority and supremacy is tested, as the demons locked deep inside of them will not stand to have their (i.e., Satan's) 'seat of authority' threatened. Just as Jesus said to the idolatrous Scribes and Pharisees in Matthew chapter 23, the same applies to our idolatrous religious leaders today. You love to sit in the seat of Moses (just as the Pope <u>sits in the **seat of Peter**</u>), with the <u>honor</u> (i.e., spiritual and emotional supremacy) of being called Rabbi, and to exalt yourselves with the name of God. But you are <u>blind</u> in that <u>you bind heavy man-made</u> burdens (such as unrighteous guilt and shame, in addition to unrighteous physical workloads, the greatest of which is **causing** people to <u>fight wars</u>) on people's backs, condemning them for the <u>smallest</u>, petty things (as 'a gnat is to a camel'), and extorting money from them in the name of God, while you (due to blindness) neglect true justice and mercy. And you blindly do all this because you have broken **God's 1st and Primary Commandment**, SWEaring falsely by God and by heaven'. Note here that Jeremiah 5.2 makes it clear that 'They may swear things in the <u>name</u> of God, yet <u>surely they **swear**</u> falsely', and Zechariah 5.4 says 'I (God) will send out a <u>Curse</u> on the one who swears falsely by **My name**'. Thus, we must understand that, because 'those swearing by heaven' are actually tricked (being *arrogant* and *blind*) by Satan into 'unknowingly swearing falsely (as mentioned in Matthew 5.33) by <u>heaven</u> and the name of God', rigidly and absolutely saying that 'By God's name this is the truth', Jesus says 'Do not swear by heaven, which is God's throne' (Matthew 5.34 and James 5.12). And by saying this, Jesus is ultimately *restating* Part 3 of the 1st Commandment - 'You shall not take the name of God in vain' - as 'swearing by heaven' (or 'unknowingly swearing falsely by God's name' saying 'God said this is absolutely the truth') is the very beginnings of idolatry, and where Satan plants his Seeds of <u>supremacy</u> and 'false authority from God'; which ultimately **cause** (many times by blind, unknowing hypocrites) 'injustice and merciless oppression' that leads to 'division, war, and hate' (i.e., the destruction of humanity).

Now if you don't think 'speaking or swearing falsely on God's behalf' (especially from behind false idols) and 'a perceived (false) authority from God' ultimately causes and are 'the seeds of division, war, and hate', then consider (in Judges chapters 17&18) the violence of 'the people of Laish (a quiet and peaceful people with no 'actual' rulers) being slaughtered (Judges 18.27) by the Danites', which occurred because Micah's false prophet (speaking from behind Micah's false idols that were to represent 'capital G' 'God') told the Danites - with a seemingly harmless blessing, setting the seeds in their minds - that 'It was God's will (i.e., they had God's blessing) for the Danites to kill the peaceful people of Laish and take their land' (see Judges 18.6&10)... although it was not God's will. And so after stealing Micah's idols and false prophet (or priest), the Danites in fact slaughtered the people of Laish; noting for future reference that they believed that by having these false idols and the false prophet as a 'divine medium', they somehow essentially had gained possession of God, thereby also gaining power. So we must realize that all of this 'division, war, and hate' happened because of the seemingly harmless Seed of 'Micah's false prophet unknowingly and blindly speaking falsely on God's behalf'; noting here that he did this after 'swearing an oath to God' as 'priest' in Judges 17.12, just as priests (or any other religious leader) today, being 'ordained into the priesthood', swear an oath. Knowing this, we can see why **James 5.12** says "But above all, <u>do not swear by heaven</u> or by earth, or with <u>any other **oath**</u> (such as a **priest's <u>oath</u> of ordination**). But let your **'Yes'** be **'Yes'**, and your **'No'** be 'No', so that you do not fall into (blind) hypocrisy." To further explain, since those who 'swear (falsely) by heaven' (of course creating a false persona of God) are the cause of 'division, war, and hate', their 'Yes, I love God' (noting that Adam and Eve thought they were God-like, while actually being Satan-like) is really an unknowing and blind (as they don't cognitively say it) 'No, I hate God', and their 'Yes, I love my neighbor' is really an unknowing and blind 'No, I hate my neighbor', thereby making them blind, unknowing **hypocrites** who <u>blame</u> the 'division, war, and hate' on everyone else, when they are actually the ones Causing the 'division, war, and hate'. Hence, because 'speaking or swearing falsely on God's behalf' (i.e., idolatry) is the **seed** that causes the destruction of humanity - just as 'Micah's false prophet's words in the name of God' was the seed that caused 'the destruction of the peaceful people of Laish and their city' - Jesus says 'Men will be forgiven of all their sins, but the sin of taking God's name and <u>speaking</u> (or <u>swearing</u>) <u>falsely</u> on His behalf (i.e., breaking the <u>2nd</u> **Commandment** and **blasphemy** against the Holy Spirit) will **not be forgiven'** (Matthew 12.31).

If we consider a <u>parallel</u> where 'this world (i.e., humanity) = God's business', then we can begin to understand <u>Satan's motives</u> for wanting to <u>destroy humanity</u>. Think of a business where an owner hires a manager. After a while, the *manager* starts to see himself as <u>equal</u> to the owner, and ultimately becomes <u>jealous</u>; envious and resentful of the owner, wanting to split off and <u>start his own business</u> in order to have all the glory, authority, and supremacy of being the owner. And of course, once the manager starts his new business, <u>he would like nothing more than to see his old boss' business fail</u>.

But, as happens many times, the manager had <u>no idea</u> what it took to start the business, and he, <u>not being qualified</u> (although his *pride* would not allow him to believe it), is ultimately the one who fails. If

you understand that, in 'The Parable of the Two Sons' (see Section 18), the 2 Sons are Jesus (who is the 1st Son), and *Satan* (who is the 2nd son), then you can see that Jesus and Satan are essentially the 2 managers of God's vineyard (or business), noting that Satan never 'managed in the flesh'. Satan, jealous and envious of God's supreme authority and glory - being Owner (i.e., Creator) of this world - and not wanting to work for God anymore as **subservient** to Him, **proudly** went behind God's back (after saying he would work) to try and start a new business. And like all proud people who think they can do anything, but really have no idea what it really takes ('work-wise'), Satan actually thought that 'he could create his own business'; i.e., Satan actually was so proud and arrogant that 'he thought he could be the Creator'. As Isaiah 14.13-17 says, 'Satan wants to exalt his throne above God and His angels. Satan wants to ascend above the heights of the clouds, to be <u>supreme like the Most High</u>, and to have people look at him **as if** he made the world'. But Satan can't make the world because 'he is **not** the <u>Maker</u>', but simply 'what is made'. And so Satan, <u>not</u> having the **qualifications** of the Creator, thereby being destined to fail with his business, would like nothing more than to see his old Boss' business (which is humanity) fail. I.e., Satan's jealousy and envy of God's supreme authority, glory, and ability as <u>Creator</u> is the <u>reason</u> why <u>Satan wants to **destroy** or <u>sabotage humanity</u>. If you don't think this is true,</u> then consider the following, understanding that 'we are made in God's image', with Satan, the Arrogant One, attempting to re-make some people in his image - which is 'arrogant, yet ignorant' - so that they lack abilities which they **claim** to have. Many times the most arrogant (or **proud**) people are often lacking the abilities of more humble, talented people; while of course pretending to be highly skilled. If the <u>humble person</u> creates something spectacular, would the <u>proud</u> and <u>arrogant person</u>, knowing that they could **never create** anything remotely close, not want to spitefully **sabotage**, **undermine**, or <u>destroy</u> the talented person's creation, out of jealousy and envy, in order for the talented person to <u>not receive any glory?</u> Is not the **height of envy** to, knowing that you <u>can't have</u> 'what the other person has', destroy 'what it is that they have', in order to see them without? Thus, Satan is no different, knowing he can never have humanity as his own, and could never be the Creator. And Satan, being MOre proud, arrogant, jealous, and envious than our human minds can comprehend, wants to spitefully **destroy** God's perfect creation, <u>humanity</u>, out of <u>jealous envy</u> of 'God's abilities as Creator, and His subsequent supreme authority over all that He has created'.

Therefore, just as Satan <u>covets</u> 'the supreme authority of God', with people bowing to him <u>as if</u> he is God - it helps here to think of 'a <u>manager</u> who walks around <u>acting like he's the owner'</u> - Satan tricks people into <u>also</u> '<u>coveting</u> the supremacy and authority of God', making them <u>believe</u> that it is truly God who wants them to have 'the <u>false authority and supremacy</u> over others that Satan is offering'; remembering that Satan is only offering this '<u>false</u> honor of authority' to use people as <u>unwitting puppets</u>, who <u>blindly lead humanity into self-destruction</u> and <u>desolation</u>. Hence, Satan's temptations are 'temptations of <u>control</u>, <u>power</u>, <u>money</u>, <u>glory</u>, <u>authority</u>, <u>and supremacy'</u>, and <u>not</u> so much '<u>drinking</u>, <u>drugs</u>, <u>and sexuality'</u> (as our blind religious leaders <u>continually assert</u>); realizing that overindulgence in these things many times is merely a <u>backlash</u> or <u>response</u> to 'the <u>spiritual and emotional repression</u> that our religious leaders inflict on the multitudes'. Also note that Satan tempted Jesus with <u>control</u> and <u>power</u> (<u>not</u> <u>drinking</u> or <u>sexuality</u>) in the desert, saying, 'I (Satan) will give You

(Jesus) control of and authority over all the kingdoms of the world if You worship before me' (Luke 4.5-7), recognizing here that Satan, in an attempt to trick Jesus, had even 'disguised himself as God' to Jesus; considering that, if this was not true, then it would not have been a temptation. And so we must understand that, if Satan A) disguises himself as God or any voice of righteousness, B) redefines good and evil, thereby making evil seem God-like and virtuous, and C) offers people false authority and supremacy in God's name, then he can trick people (usually leaders) into ruling unjustly over others, oppressing and enslaving them, while the whole time thinking that it is 'God-like and God-approved' to do so; when in reality it is actually 'Satan-like and Satan-approved'. Note here that, if this seems hard to accept, consider a micro-level parallel where parents (acting as 'rulers'), thinking that they could never hurt their OWn Children, actually inflict a great deal of either emotional or physical abuse on a child (being Satan-like), all while truly believing that it is right (i.e., God-like and God-approved), or 'in the best interest of the child'. Thus, we must realize that the temptation of 'being like God' as 'the justified oppression and enslavement of others', thereby blindly and unknowingly 'being like Satan'.

So, as the temptation of 'being like God' is the oldest temptation, this of course was the temptation of Adam and Eve 'in the beginning'. I.e., Adam and Eve were tricked by being told by Satan that 'their actions were God-like, virtuous, and righteous', while actually being 'Satan-like, defiled, and corrupt'. First of all, it is **important** to recognize that 'being like God' from the story of Adam and Eve, means **'thinking** that you are acting like God or **in accordance** with God'. 'Being like God' does **not** mean that 'you think you are or could be God', and it is important to know the difference. Satan might think that 'he could be God', but he also realizes that our human minds cannot really CONCEIVE being the Creator. So he tempts us with the idea of 'by acting a certain way, we will be acting like God', when in actuality we are unknowingly 'acting like Satan'. So in the story of Adam and Eve, 'being like God' = 'truly <u>believing</u> that you are **God-like**, with your actions being <u>God-approved</u>, and <u>thinking</u> that you are close to God, while Unknowingly being Satan-like, with your actions being prompted by Satan (who has disguised himself as God), thereby blindly moving farther away from God'. And remember that 'being Satan-like' = 'man's lust for <u>supremacy</u> and <u>authority</u> over others, having people serve and bow down before them'; or what people wrongly perceive as 'being supreme like God', as God's absolute authority and supremacy over all does **not** mean that 'He wants to be served', but to serve, just as 'Jesus (the express image of God) came to serve humanity' (Matthew 20.28), realizing that 'to serve humanity' is ultimately 'to serve God' anyway. So we must recognize that 'Satan's redefined <u>Version</u> of being God-like' = 'having supremacy over others'; or Satan tricks us into believing that 'truly being God-like' is 'to be supreme like God'. In other words, Satan tempts people with 'practicing supremacy over others, while simultaneously making them think that this supremacy is approved by God, in accordance with His will, and is how God acts'. This means that, many people who 'do the will of Satan and are Satan-like', do so thinking that they are 'doing the will of God and are God-like' (see John 16.2). And so 'wanting to be **supreme** like God' is not 'God-like', as truly being God-like means

'<u>having</u> the authority and supremacy, yet <u>reluctantly</u> wanting to use it, and <u>not wanting</u> to exercise authority and supremacy over anyone, if at all possible'; remembering that Peter exhorts his fellow elders to 'not lord over the flock, but merely be an example' (1 Peter 5.1-3), with Jesus saying to 'not be like the heathen rulers who practice **absolute rule**, but rather be like a <u>servant</u> to be a great leader' (Matthew 20.25-28). Truly being *God-like* is 'not wanting to be supreme like God, desiring maximum equality and freedom for all'; i.e., God does not like or enjoy His ultimate supremacy and preeminence, and that is 'what makes Him God'. So to be truly God-like is 'to be someone who hates bossing and ordering people around, yet is simultaneously the one **most** qualified to lead others, teaching them ultimately to lead themselves'. To be truly **God-like** means 'being a ruler who wants others to eventually rule themselves'; which ultimately describes Jesus, 'the King of kings' (Revelation 19.16), as Jesus is 'the Ruler who wants everyone to be <u>free</u>, <u>ruling themselves</u> with <u>maximum self-governance</u>', thereby being His friends, not His servants (see John 15.15). Note that this is 'the government of peace and *justice that will last forever'*, as described in Isaiah 9.7. Hence, people (namely our religious leaders) wrongly perceive 'being God-like and a servant of God' as 'exercising over others the supremacy and authority associated with the name of God'. So people (such as Adam and Eve) who are tricked by Satan, truly have a desire to be associated with God, 'seeking God out' to receive authority from Him, thereby thinking that they are openly accepting God, and being completely fine with 'a position of 2^{nd} in command underneath God and/or Jesus', as they are told by Satan that 'God has chosen them to rule over people'. But in reality, it is Satan who chose them to rule, granting false authority in order to rule nations from behind the scenes, in the unseen realm. Or, it is Satan, disguised as God, who corrupts God's truly chosen leaders (i.e., Satan corrupted Jeroboam in 1 Kings 12.28 after God granted him rule over 10 tribes of Israel in 1 Kings 11.31). Therefore, in the story of Adam and Eve, 'the temptation (or offer) of being like God' is really 'the temptation of wanting to be supreme like God', which, actually being Satan-like, is beautifully hidden and disguised as 'serving God and being truly God-like'; recognizing that people always fall for this temptation thinking that 'they will be associated with, and closer to God', **not** that 'they will be opposing, rejecting, and getting farther away from God'. I.e., Eve thought that she would be *closer* to God by eating the fruit, **not** *farther away*. Furthermore, throughout the following discussion on Adam and Eve, we must continually remind ourselves that, since it is our <u>religious leaders</u> who stand up and assert, whether <u>spoken</u> or <u>unspoken</u>, that 'they are <u>most like</u> God, knowing what is true good and what is true evil', odds are that it is also our religious leaders who have fallen for the same temptation of Adam and Eve, 'wanting to be supreme like God, and thinking that it is truly God-like to covet and practice that supremacy'.

Most people, when asked, do not even know 'what Adam and Eve did that was so wrong' because their story in the Bible is disguised as a fable, or a parable, such as Jesus told in the New Testament. If you don't think this is true, then consider that 'serpents do not talk', 'Adam and Eve did not physically die when they ate the fruit', 'trees do not produce fruit that, when eaten, imparts knowledge', and 'Adam and Eve were never physically blind'. So it is important to recognize that the fable of Adam and Eve is disguised using personification (think of the way we personify 'the tortoise and the hare', giving them human qualities, thereby teaching about human nature), metaphors, and the imagery of 'an

innocent childlike couple in a green garden'. But Adam and Eve's sin of 'coveting the supremacy of God' (i.e., 'wanting to be supreme like God') is the sin of an adult who lusts after authority, control, power, and glory, justifying their oppression and enslavement of others with the name of God; which is far from 'childlike'. Additionally, we have been taught that 'the fall of man' occurred when 'Adam and Eve opposed God's will (i.e., disobeyed God) by eating the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil', treating 'the fall of man' with a sort of innocence, as if 'Adam and Eve simply ate God's favorite fruit', with God (being wrongly portrayed as acting rather petty) then throwing them out of the garden. But 'the fall of man' occurred because 'Adam and Eve wanted to have absolute supremacy over others', not because they actually ate God's favorite fruit, just as any other curious child would do; which wrongly depicts Adam and Eve as 'simple-minded children'. And so by metaphorically eating Satan's false knowledge and wisdom - which was represented by 'a piece of desirable fruit' - Adam and Eve practiced absolute supremacy over others, truly believing that it was actually God-like and God-approved to do so. Hence, the story of Adam and Eve - which is really a fable teaching about basic human nature (think of Icarus' excessive pride) - states, in its simplest form, that:

the fall of man (i.e., the downfall of <u>any</u> man or woman, <u>not</u> just Adam and Eve)

=

his **blind ambition** to have **supremacy** over others, **believing** his actions are **God-like**, yet in truth, his actions are **Satan-like**.

Thus, 'the fall of man', and the reason that we divide, make war, and hate, are both rooted in 'man's envy of God's authority and supremacy'. I.e., as all men and women are created as equals, a supreme mindset is 'the downfall of mankind' and the breeding ground for 'division war, and hate'. Vaguely, and with a great deal of erroneous misinterpretation, we have always been taught that 'Adam and Eve disobeyed God', but 'the fall of man' (i.e., 'What Adam and Eve did that was so wrong') pertains specifically to 'man disobeying God, while truly believing that he is obeying God, thereby practicing <u>false</u> authority and <u>false</u> supremacy (granted by Satan) over others, which in turn <u>causes</u> the injustices of oppression, terror, fear, violence, enslavement, senseless hate and hurt, starvation, homelessness, and overall Cruelty to humanity'. Note here that, if you think it is impossible to 'disobey God, while truly believing that you are obeying God', then consider that 'they crucified Jesus (an innocent Man) thinking they were serving God' (see John 16.2), with Jesus saying on the cross "Forgive them Father, they don't know what they are doing" (Luke 23.34); not to mention the fact that Jesus said 'Both the leaders and all of their followers are **blindly** walking into a ditch' (Matthew 15.14). So by not understanding that this is the <u>true sin</u> of Adam and Eve, <u>humanity</u> (specifically our religious leaders, and consequently the governmental leaders that <u>listen</u> to them) has <u>blindly repeated</u> the sin of Adam and Eve over and over again throughout the ages, realizing also that 'the sin of Adam and Eve' is played out each and every time someone abuses or oppresses others (whether mentally, spiritually, physically, or emotionally) with the intent of 'supremely lording over them' (see Matthew 20.25). And by our leaders (both religious and governmental) **blindly repeating** the sin of Adam and Eve - thinking their unjust and oppressive ways are God-like, when they are really Satan-like - Satan has been able to use them as his

<u>unknowing puppets</u> in order to <u>rule the nations from behind the scenes</u>, thereby causing 'division, war, hate, and overall desolation' in the names of God and Jesus. Additionally it should be noted that, by Christian/Catholics <u>erroneously</u> believing that '<u>water baptism</u> takes away the sin of Adam and Eve' (i.e., the <u>fabricated</u> idea of <u>original sin</u>, see Section 13), <u>thinking</u> that they have received some sort of <u>inoculation</u> to a disease (realizing that they don't even understand <u>what</u> 'the <u>real disease</u> or <u>sin</u> of Adam and Eve' is in the first place), they place themselves in a position to <u>unknowingly repeat the same exact</u> <u>mistakes of Adam and Eve</u>, ultimately feeling, to some degree, a <u>false sense of immunity</u> to '<u>whatever</u> they think the sin of Adam and Eve may have been'. So again, the sin of Adam and Eve is 'to <u>blindly</u> think that the ambition to have supremacy over others is <u>God-like</u>', and there is <u>no amount of water</u> that can be poured on top of someone, and <u>no amount of spiritual sorcery</u> that can make someone <u>immune</u> to the propensity for committing this sin.

<u>The story of **Adam and Eve**</u> from Genesis 2.15 through 3.24 is summarized, and then discussed as follows.

The Lord God took Adam and put him in the Garden of Eden to tend and keep it. And the Lord God commanded Adam saying 'Of every tree (including 'the Tree of Life') of the garden you may freely eat; but of the **tree** of the **knowledge** of **good** and **evil** you shall **not** eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die'. Now the serpent was more cunning than any beast of the field. And the serpent said to Eve 'You will **not** surely die if you eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. For God knows that <u>in the day</u> that you eat of it, your <u>eyes will be</u> opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.' So when Eve saw that the tree was good for food, that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree desirable to make one WiSe, she took of its fruit and ate. She also gave to her husband, and he ate. Then (with an understood time lapse) the eyes of both of them were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together and made coverings for themselves. They then heard the sound of the Lord God walking in the garden, and Adam and his wife hid themselves from His presence. The Lord God called to Adam and said to him 'Where are you?' So Adam said 'I heard Your voice in the garden, and I was afraid because I was <u>naked</u>'. God said to Adam '<u>Who</u> told you that you were naked? Have you eaten from the tree of which I commanded you that you should not eat?' Adam answered 'Eve gave me the fruit and I ate'. Then the Lord God said to Eve 'What is this you have done?' Eve answered saying 'The serpent deceived me, and I ate'. So God cursed the serpent, putting enmity between his seed (i.e., Satan) and Eve's Seed (i.e., Jesus). Also for Adam and Eve, God made tunics of skin, and clothed them. Then God said 'Behold, Adam and Eve have become like Us, to know good and evil' (noting here that they now know and can manipulate 2 <u>versions</u> of good and evil). Therefore, so they will not put out their hand and take also of the Tree of Life, and eat, and live forever, God drove them out of the Garden of Eden to till the ground from which they came, and guarded 'the way to the Tree of Life' with angels and a flaming sword which turned in every direction.

With countless <u>false</u> interpretations of Adam and Eve placed in our minds from the time of childhood, it may be difficult at first to understand the <u>true</u> interpretation of Adam and Eve; especially for <u>false</u>

<u>prophets</u> who <u>think</u> that they are <u>true Prophets</u>. So, in order for the story of Adam and Eve to make sense, a number of elements should first be recognized.

A) 'The Garden of Eden' is <u>not</u> a <u>literal garden</u>, but 'a <u>figurative garden</u> where <u>people</u> are grown, with Adam and Eve <u>tending</u> and <u>keeping</u> the garden'. That is, <u>Eden was simply a nation</u>, or tribe of people, and Adam and Eve were the <u>unjust</u> and <u>oppressive rulers</u> over those people. If you don't believe this, then consider some of the many biblical quotes (in the following bullet points) that metaphorically depict 'a <u>group of people'</u> as being 'a <u>vineyard</u>, a <u>field</u>, or (in this case) a <u>garden'</u>, 'people <u>individually'</u> as being 'vines, <u>stalks of wheat</u>, <u>plants</u>, <u>branches</u>, or <u>trees'</u>, and 'rulers' as being 'those <u>who tend and keep</u> a vineyard or garden' (see Jeremiah 12.10 and Matthew 21.45).

- lsaiah 5.7 which is also talking about 'oppressive and unjust practices of leaders' in the same verse where he refers to 'people' as being 'wild grape vines growing in a vineyard' says "For the vineyard of the Lord is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah are His pleasant plant. He (God) looked for justice, but behold, oppression; for righteousness, but behold, a cry for help." So to be clear 'the nations of Israel and Judah = a figurative vineyard (i.e., a garden)', and 'men (i.e., people) = figurative plants (i.e., grapevines) that grow in a vineyard', realizing that 'fruit' = 'what men produce', whether it is A) something non-tangible, such as knowledge, doctrine, or a belief system (i.e., ideas like truth and justice which encompass a government), or B) something tangible such as food, clothing, housing, businesses, etc. I.e. Figurative fruit is essentially 'anything and everything that people produce'. Note here also that Jeremiah 12.10 speaks of the same oppressive and unjust practices of the leaders saying "Many rulers, shepherds, and pastors have destroyed My (God) vineyard".
- In John 15.1 Jesus says "I am the true Vine, and My Father is the Vinedresser"; adding that verses 2-6 say 'We are branches stemming from Jesus (the true Vine) that either bear fruit or don't bear fruit, with those not bearing fruit being uprooted and burned by the Vinedresser'. Noting also that this compares to Matthew 15.13: "Every plant (referring to the Scribes and Pharisees) which My heavenly Father has not planted will be uprooted". And in the same figurative language Jesus is referred to as 'the Branch' in Zechariah 3.8, with Satan being likened to an 'abominable branch' in Isaiah 14.19.
- 'The Parable of the Evil Tenants of God's <u>Vineyard'</u> in Matthew 21.33-46 is about God planting a <u>figurative</u> vineyard of people (assumed to be 'the nations of Israel and Judah'), with the tenants of the vineyard, or vinedressers (i.e., the religious leaders, including the Pharisees, Scribes, and Chief Priests) acting as <u>unjust</u> and <u>oppressive</u> <u>rulers</u> of the people (just like their <u>predecessors</u> Adam and Eve), wanting to keep all of the people's fruit for themselves (of course claiming that 'The fruit is actually <u>for</u> God').

By comparing 'Jeremiah 11.18-19 and 12.2' and 'Matthew 7.15-20' with the idea of 'a tree located in the Garden of Eden producing fruit containing knowledge of good and evil', it becomes clear that 'the tree of knowledge in the Garden of Eden' is not a tree at all, but (just as previously mentioned, 'people = vines, branches, plants, etc.') the tree is actually a person. And to be specific, 'the tree of knowledge in the Garden of Eden', from which Satan wants so desperately for people to eat its fruit, is one of Satan's false prophets, or is representative of 'multiple false prophets, speaking their lies in unison for Satan'. I.e., 'the tree of the **knowledge of good and evil in the Garden of Eden = a false prophet'**. This is proven as follows. Jeremiah 11.18-19, speaking about the people of Anathoth who want to kill him, says "Now the Lord gave me knowledge (of the people's idolatry with Baal and other transgressions of the law), and I **know** it. But I (Jeremiah) was like a docile lamb, and did not know that they had devised schemes against me, saying 'Let us destroy the **tree** (i.e., Jeremiah) with its **fruit** (of knowledge of the people's idolatry), and let us CUT **him** off (as with a tree) from the land of the living'." So to clarify, 'Jeremiah (a true Prophet) = a figurative tree', bearing (i.e., speaking) 'fruit of true knowledge' concerning the people's worship of the false god, Baal; noting that <u>Isaiah 61.3</u> also uses this <u>same</u> type of figurative language, referring to 'those who <u>believe</u> and <u>follow</u> the words of Christ' as **'trees** of righteousness' and 'plantings of the Lord', with Jeremiah 17.7-8 reiterating that 'A man who trusts in the Lord will be like a tree yielding fruit in the year of drought'. Now immediately following Jeremiah 11.18-19, Jeremiah 12.2 says - concerning the idolatrous people (specifically their <u>false prophets</u>) who want to <u>kill</u> him - "You (God) have **planted** them, yes, they have taken root. They grow, yes, **they bear (bad) fruit**. You (God) are <u>near in their mouth</u>, but <u>far from their mind</u>." And so here (similar to the previous quote) Jeremiah is essentially saying that 'the false prophets = figurative trees', bearing (i.e., speaking) 'fruit of false knowledge' that is disguised with the name of God (i.e., 'You are <u>near</u> in their <u>mouth</u>') as being '<u>fruit</u> of <u>true</u> knowledge'. On the side, it is interesting to notice the language of 'the blind man receiving sight' in Mark 8.24: "I see men like trees, walking".

Jesus, in Matthew 7.15-20, reiterates Jeremiah's figurative language (see also **Luke 3.8-9**) by saying "Beware of <u>false prophets</u>, who come to you in <u>sheep's clothing</u>, but <u>inwardly</u> they are ravenous <u>wolves</u>. You will know them (i.e., <u>false prophets</u>) by their <u>fruits</u>. A <u>bad tree</u> bears <u>bad</u> <u>fruit</u>. Every <u>tree</u> that does <u>not</u> bear <u>good fruit</u> is <u>cut down and thrown into the fire</u>." So to clarify, Jesus (which compares to Luke 6.43&45 where 'an evil man' = 'a bad tree') is saying here that 'a <u>false prophet</u>' = 'a bad tree that bears bad fruit (i.e., bad or <u>false knowledge</u>)'. And while people with spiritual sight, such as Jesus, may be able to <u>identify</u> 'what is good or bad fruit', Jesus does say that 'false prophets <u>disguise themselves</u> as harmless sheep, while they are really ravenous wolves', meaning that 'bad trees <u>disguise</u> their bad fruit as good

fruit'. This concept in Matthew 7.15-20 is the **key** to 'truly understanding the story of Adam and Eve'. I.e., by Jesus saying that 'bad trees disquise themselves as good trees, just as ravenous wolves disquise themselves as harmless sheep', we know that 'the bad tree of knowledge in the Garden of Eden disquised itself as a good tree of knowledge, and its bad, poisonous fruit of false knowledge as good, nourishing fruit of true knowledge'. And, since both Jeremiah and Jesus say that these 'bad trees bearing bad fruit' figuratively represent 'false prophets who speak a false version of God's true definition of good and evil', we know - recalling that Satan wanted desperately for Eve to eat the fruit, and God did not want Eve to eat the fruit - that 'the tree of knowledge in the Garden of Eden' = 'a false prophet speaking the lies of Satan'; of course ultimately meaning that 'the tree of the knowledge of good and evil' represents 'a false persona of God'.

As a side note, if you compare Genesis 2.7 ('God formed man of the dust of the ground') with Genesis **2.9** ('God made every <u>tree</u> out of <u>dust</u> of the ground'), it becomes even more obvious that, figuratively speaking, 'a tree = a person', with **both** being 'made of dust of the ground'. Note also from Genesis 2.9 that 2 trees are listed separately: A) 'the Tree of Life', which represents Jesus (or Jesus' true Prophets; see Proverbs 11.30 where 'the Tree of Life' = 'righteous people'), whose true knowledge brings eternal life (making it actually 'the Tree of <u>True</u> Knowledge'), and <u>B)</u> 'the tree of the knowledge of good and evil', which represents <u>Satan</u> (or Satan's false prophets), whose false knowledge brings eternal death. And, as these 2 trees are listed separately from the **other** trees, it Can't be said that 'Satan's tree' is 'one of the trees that is pleasant in the sight of God, being good for food' (Genesis 2.9). Note also here that, in Genesis 3.6, Eve, being spiritually blind, did think that 'Satan's tree' was 'pleasant to her eyes (not God's eyes) and good for food'; although it was because Satan disguised his 'poisonous fruit' as 'good fruit' in order to trick Eve into eating it. Think here how 'to kill ants' you can trick them by feeding them 'boric acid (i.e., poison) mixed with sugar', thereby disguising the poison as 'desirable, good food'. So if we as humans can understand this concept, then you can be sure that Satan <u>also</u> understands how to trick us by 'making his poison <u>seem like</u> desirable, good food'.

Finally, and possibly <u>most importantly</u>, we must understand that the figurative language in the Bible is somewhat 'loose', or **not** <u>exactly</u> the same in <u>every</u> instance, as - only a <u>few verses</u> <u>previous</u> to 'referring to <u>himself</u> as a <u>tree</u>' - Jeremiah 11.16 says 'the <u>nations</u> of Israel and Judah' = 'a Green Olive <u>Tree</u> that was <u>supposed</u> to produce <u>good fruit</u>, yet it's <u>branches</u> (i.e., people) are broken, and so God has <u>set it on fire</u>'; realizing that this also <u>corresponds</u> to Matthew 21.19 where 'Jesus <u>withers</u> the <u>non-fruit bearing fig tree</u>', which of course represented Israel and Judah. This essentially means that <u>either</u> 'a tree = <u>one person</u>', <u>Or</u> 'a tree = <u>many people</u>', with the understanding that, if '<u>rulers</u> of nations' = 'individual trees', and 'the <u>nation</u> that these individual trees are ruling over' can also be referred to as 'a tree of many people', then '<u>the individual ruler tree</u>' can be used <u>somewhat interchangeably</u> with '<u>the nation tree</u>', as 'the

many people who make up the nation' do as the ruler instructs them to do. So now knowing that 'trees are representative of nations of people, as well as individual people', Ezekiel 31.3 says 'the nation of Egypt' = 'a great cedar tree', then goes on to say that "No tree in the garden of God was like it in beauty. So all the **trees** of **Eden** envied it, that were in the **garden** of God" (Ezekiel 31.8-9); realizing here that God is going to cut down this 'great tree' for proudly exalting itself. Here Ezekiel essentially makes the <u>parallel</u> that '<u>all the nations</u> of the world' = '<u>the Garden</u> of Eden', and 'individual nations' = 'trees in the Garden of Eden', which means that 'trees in the Garden of Eden' were most definitely symbolic in nature, figuratively referring to 'one or many people'; i.e., either 'an individual ruler tree' such as Pharaoh, the king of Egypt (see Ezekiel 31.2), as well as **Nebuchadnezzar**, the *king* of Babylon (see Daniel 4.20-22 where Nebuchadnezzar = a massive, <u>fruit</u> bearing <u>tree</u>), **or** 'a nation tree of <u>many people</u>' such as <u>Egypt</u>. Hence, this figurative language used by Ezekiel **proves** in itself that, at the very least, 'the tree of knowledge in the Garden of Eden' represented either 'one or many people (i.e., false prophets or religious leaders)', and was therefore definitely not a literal tree, but rather a figurative tree. Furthermore, this also means we must consider that the original Eden of Adam and Eve's time may have been more like an empire, encompassing different tribes or nations of people; of course realizing that 'the <u>tree</u> of knowledge' would still be representative of 'the <u>false prophets</u> who <u>ruled</u> (from behind the scenes) a particular tribe or nation in Eden'.

Therefore, the preceding bullet points show that 'Eden was a dwelling place or nation for a sizable group of people (i.e., trees)', or even possibly 'an empire over different tribes or nations of people (also considered 'trees')', meaning that Eden was not 'a literal garden containing two isolated people'. I.e., contrary to what our religious leaders have taught us, Adam and Eve were not the first humans **on earth**. And to further reiterate this, consider the following points. Genesis 1.27-28 says 'God created <u>male</u> and <u>female</u>, telling them to be <u>fruitful</u> (again implying that <u>people</u> = figurative <u>trees</u>) and multiply; fill the earth with people'. This occurred <u>before</u> Adam and Eve were given Eden to rule over. Additionally, it is said in Genesis 4.14-15 that 'Whoever (or anyone who) kills Cain, vengeance shall be taken on him sevenfold'. Hence, there were obviously other people on the earth besides 'Adam, Eve, and Cain'; other people who may have wanted to kill Cain. Furthermore, Genesis 4.17 says that 'Cain knew his wife, and she conceived and bore Enoch', which also points to the fact that there were other people on the earth; noting that Cain - after killing Abel - was the only remaining child of Adam and Eve, meaning that Cain had to have 'knew' a woman conceived by another male and female other than Adam and Eve. Thus, all of these things make it more than obvious that 'the Garden of Eden was **not** a literal garden, but a figurative garden where people (represented as trees) were grown', with Adam and Eve - not being the only two people on earth - acting as ruthless and unjust rulers over this 'figurative garden of people'. And, if we consider that 'we too are figurative trees that make up a figurative garden', then we must realize that Christ will return to 'cut down and burn every bad tree (i.e., false prophet) that produces poisonous fruit of false knowledge' (Matthew 7.19); realizing of course that, by our false prophets inciting (or 'producing the fruit of') 'division, war, and hate' by their false knowledge of God's true persona, they themselves as a whole can be considered to represent 'the tree of division,

war, and hate'. So just as 'the tree of division, war, and hate will be uprooted and burned when Christ returns', so too will the <u>individual</u> trees (i.e., religious leaders) which produce the poisonous fruit of false knowledge that incites 'division, war, and hate', as these trees have grown far too large (just like Pharaoh and 'the great tree of Egypt'), and are now keeping light from reaching us (i.e., 'the rest of the garden') thereby stifling any growth underneath their looming darkness.

B) We are told as 'people outside looking in' that 'the <u>serpent</u> is <u>more cunning</u> than any other beast', but Eve, being <u>spiritually blind</u>, could not recognize the serpent as being <u>cunning</u>; noting this fable <u>implies</u> that 'Eve had <u>no prior knowledge</u> of serpents and their <u>deceptive abilities</u>'. So in other words, <u>the cunning serpent Surely did not identify himself</u> as 'a <u>cunning servant</u>', just as Satan surely does <u>not</u> identify himself as 'Satan', showing you his 'pitchfork, horns, and tail', but rather identifies himself as 'Jesus'; remembering also that Jesus says 'false prophets (i.e., ravenous wolves) identify themselves as <u>harmless sheep</u>'. Hence, just as Satan <u>disguises</u> his voice as 'the voice of God', the <u>serpent</u> <u>disguised</u> his voice as 'a voice of <u>righteousness</u> and <u>reason</u> that was only trying to give Eve wisdom'; remembering that 'the poisonous tree itself' is disguised as 'a good tree bearing good fruit'.

C) It is important to realize a <u>major discrepancy</u> in the way we have been taught to read 'the <u>temptation</u> part of this story'; that is, a major discrepancy in the perceived vocal inflections of the serpent and Eve. We have been falsely taught that the attitude of Eve was 'Yes, I will oppose God and disobey Him', with a sort of sinister and evil inflection attached by our religious leaders. But remember, 'Satan (i.e., the serpent) is the most cunning of all the beasts in the field', disguising himself as 'an agent or angel of God' and 'a voice of true righteousness'. Therefore, Satan (with a positive vocal inflection) presents the fruit of the tree as being 'something that will bring Eve <u>closer</u> to <u>God</u> so that she will understand God's idea of true good and evil, thereby making herself more like God'. Satan presents his case to Eve as 'Surely God made a mistake in telling you this (i.e., 'God knows' from Genesis 3.5), because God wants you (Eve) to know <u>His (supposed) version</u> of good and evil so that your thoughts and actions will be <u>aligned</u> with God's thoughts and actions'. This is the great deception in the temptation of Adam and Eve: that Eve did not believe she would really be opposing God by eating the fruit. Note that, if this is hard to believe, think of how many people, after being told in Part 2 of the 1st Commandment 'Do <u>not</u> make, serve, or bow down to <u>any likeness</u> of <u>anything in heaven</u> or on earth', then 'make, serve, and bow down to images of Christ and Mary' saying 'Surely God did not mean to include images of Christ and Mary'; not realizing that false prophets can speak their lies (breaking Part 3 of the 1st Commandment, unknowingly swearing falsely by God's name) from behind these images... which ultimately means that, just like Adam and Eve, people (whether teacher or follower) are '<u>blindly</u> getting **farther away** from God, defiling His true persona and intentions, and <u>following Satan</u>' while truly believing that they are 'praising God, being virtuous, and following God'. So we must recognize that the conventional misinterpretation of this story makes it out as 'Adam and Eve ate the fruit so that they could essentially be God, thereby opposing or doing away with God'. But that is wrong, and Adam and Eve (just as our religious leaders today, and the religious leaders of yesterday such as the Scribes and the Pharisees) ate the fruit truly believing (due to spiritual blindness) that they

would be <u>God-like</u> (i.e., 'like God' from Genesis 3.5), <u>virtuous</u>, and <u>holy</u>; which, as the fruit was actually 'Satan's <u>redefined</u> false version of good and evil', Adam and Eve blindly became <u>Satan-like</u>, <u>corrupted</u>, and <u>defiled</u>. Therefore, while it is <u>vaguely</u> true that 'Adam and Eve <u>disobeyed</u> God', they did so ultimately <u>believing</u> that they were really <u>obeying</u> God, as the serpent no doubt identified himself as 'an <u>agent of</u> God and of true righteousness'.

D) 'Eating the **fruit** of the tree of knowledge' represents '<u>immediate spiritual death'</u> because it is Satan's fruit of poisonous false knowledge. So now understanding that 'the fruit of the tree of knowledge' is Satan's **poisonous** fruit of **false** knowledge and wisdom, it becomes **obvious** why God said "In the day that you eat of it you shall <u>surely die</u>". Therefore, we should understand that 'eating the poisonous fruit of the tree' did **not** represent 'being given **true** knowledge' or 'being given **true** spiritual sight' (see **'E'**), but rather 'spiritual death by being blindly fed Satan's redefined false version of good and evil'; which is essentially being taught 'a false persona of God'. Think of how an undercover agent will "feed a government bogus intelligence" in order to trap or ambush them. Or how many times a crooked salesman has 'fed you wrong information' so that you will willingly, yet unknowingly and ignorantly, buy the wrong product, only to satisfy his agenda of monetary gain. Satan is no different, as he is 'the first and original crooked salesman'. Satan fed Adam and Eve 'wrong information' that was disguised as 'right information' (i.e., desirable fruit) so that they would willingly, yet unknowingly (i.e., blindly and ignorantly), choose 'evil that was disquised as good'. So 'eating the poisonous fruit of the tree' represents blindly believing that 'Satan's redefined false version of good and evil' is actually 'God's true version of good and evil'. I.e., by eating the fruit of false knowledge, Adam and Eve blindly thought that 'their Satan-like actions were actually God-like'. Think about it, Why else would Satan Want Adam and Eve to eat 'the fruit' in the first place? And why would God not Want them (i.e. 'they would surely <u>die</u>') to eat the fruit? Surely God would want Adam and Eve to <u>know</u> 'His true version of good and evil'. And so it is **key** to understand that 'the fruit' represents 'false knowledge and wisdom', or 'Satan's redefined false version of good and evil', which, if 'consumed and digested' into your mind, is the 'seed of error' that will lead to eternal damnation, thereby representing immediate spiritual death. Thus, 'Satan's version of good and evil', depicted as 'good and pleasant fruit that will make one truly wise and knowledgeable', is actually 'a false, redefined version of good and evil' that is false knowledge and figurative **poisonous** fruit that causes **spiritual death** by teaching people a 'supreme mindset' which is <u>blindly perceived</u> as being a 'righteous, God-like mindset'; noting that, if you think multitudes of people can't be wrong about 'what is true good' and 'what is true evil', then consider that many people believed Jesus (i.e., the **Good** Shepherd) to be 'an **evil** sinner', thereby **proving** Satan's ability to deceive the multitudes by redefining good and evil. And so by redefining good and evil, making poisonous fruit taste good, Satan tricks the multitudes into 'gladly, joyously, and willingly walking his well disguised path to **hell** (i.e., **spiritual death**)', all while thinking that they are 'walking the path to **heaven**'.

Additionally, the <u>conventional MiSinterpretation</u> of 'the tree of knowledge' states that 'God did not want Adam and Eve to eat the fruit of <u>knowledge</u> because, if they did, they would then somehow

possess the **power** and **ability** to **create their own world**, thereby no longer needing God, as they would **know** everything that He knows'. While Satan, in his arrogance, may have at some point thought that he could be the Creator, are we really to believe the idea that 'there is a certain magic recipe of knowledge which, if absorbed into our **finite** human brains, would allow us to actually create matter out of nothing, as God, thereby being our own creators'? And are we to believe that this 'magic recipe of knowledge' was dangling from a tree in the Garden of Eden, and that (i.e., the ability to be our own creator) was the reason God did not want Adam and Eve to eat the fruit? So this line of thought lacks all basic God-given reason and common sense, being given to us by our blind and ignorant religious forefathers, who themselves ate Satan's fruit of false knowledge, and then boldly passed that ignorance on to us so that we would look at them and glorify them as 'being like God', when they were actually 'like Satan'; remembering that Satan tempts people with 'acting God-like' (which is really 'acting Satanlike'), **not** actually 'being God'. I.e., Satan's temptation was to 'be like God', not to actually 'be <u>God'</u>, as Satan knows that this is <u>out of the realm of our **finite** human minds</u>, making it <u>not really a</u> valid or feasible temptation, tempting people with something so clearly unattainable. In other words, it's like Satan tempting people with something of fiction like 'the ability to change your shape into the shape of an animal', which would quickly be dismissed as an unattainable childish whim. Thus, we must use our common sense and understand that 'there is no amount of information (i.e., knowledge) which a person can cram inside of their **finite** mind that could possibly give them the ability to create worlds, as if they are actually the infinite God', making this conventional misinterpretation nothing more than pathetic man-made knowledge which our religious leaders have concocted to deceive the multitudes into believing that 'they have some sort of divine, esoteric understanding', which of course they have used to place themselves in a position of *superiority* and *supremacy*.

E) Eve ate from the tree and did not receive immediate sight, which is important in recognizing that 'eating the fruit of the tree is NOT what gives true sight to Adam and Eve'; realizing that Satan was claiming that 'his false knowledge would give true sight'. But it is Jesus' true knowledge of good and evil (spoken of course by a true Prophet of Christ) that gives true sight to Adam and Eve, and it is Jesus who told Adam and Eve (see Genesis 3.11), sometime after (i.e., the time lapse) they had eaten Satan's fruit of false knowledge, that they were 'naked' (see 'F') or 'ignorant of true right and true wrong'. And so by recognizing this non-immediacy of sight, we can therefore also recognize an understood time lapse between 'when they ate the fruit of the tree' and 'when they received sight'. That is, Adam and Eve believed and put into practice their unjust and oppressive ways - which were a product of 'eating from Satan's tree of false knowledge' - for a period of time, presumed to be years, before they realized their nakedness.

By now we must realize that Moses wrote this parable <u>in code</u> with the intention of <u>hiding</u> its true meaning, as Moses - being the <u>ruler</u> of a nation of people *himself*, and having <u>dealt directly</u> with the <u>false prophets</u> who <u>whispered into Pharaoh's ear</u> (i.e., 'wise men, sorcerers, and magicians' in Exodus 7.11) - understood that Satan's false prophets would surely <u>destroy</u> what he

wrote if they perceived that 'it COUld be written about them and their usual role of divine counsel to the king (i.e., queen, monarch, prince, pharaoh, or any other ruler)'. Therefore, it must be reiterated that one of the <u>most misinterpreted</u> aspects of this parable is that 'the <u>fruit of the tree of knowledge</u> <u>actually gave true knowledge</u>'. And it has been misinterpreted like this because readers (specifically false prophets in search of man-made glory) are purposefully led by Moses to believe that 'Adam and Eve's sight was immediate after eating the fruit'; of course done so to ultimately have this truth of God unknowingly passed down through the generations by false prophets. But as previously noted, Eve ate the fruit and did **not** receive *immediate* sight. Genesis 3.7 says "Then the eyes of both of them were opened". So the fact that both Adam and Eve received sight Simultaneously, while they ate the fruit in Succession, one after another, points to the fact that 'the tree of knowledge did not give true knowledge or true sight'. Note here that, in Genesis 3.5, Satan did 'sell' the fruit to Eve as giving sight, which of course was 'false sight', just as the fruit represented 'false knowledge'. And so, taking into account that A) God did not want Adam and Eve to eat the fruit, while Satan desperately wanted them to eat the fruit, and also that B) Eve did not receive immediate sight, this parable of Adam and Eve only makes sense if 'the fruit was actually <u>Satan's poisonous fruit of false knowledge</u> that gave <u>false</u> sight, and true sight was not immediate, but was gained by Adam and Eve after a time lapse (presumed to be <u>many years</u>)'. I.e., there is a time lapse of years between Genesis 3.6 and Genesis 3.7. After this time lapse, it is Jesus who told Adam and Eve (referring to Genesis 3.11) that they were naked, giving them sight by His 'true knowledge of good and evil'. As God says in Genesis 3.11, "Who told you that you were <u>naked?</u>", with <u>Jesus (i.e. a **true** Prophet speaking for Christ) being 'the Who'</u>; realizing that, even if you still think 'the tree of knowledge was an actual tree', by God saying 'Who', this flawed theory falls apart, as 'who' implies that 'a person said something', and that knowledge was therefore not mysteriously absorbed into someone's mind through a piece of actual fruit from an actual tree. Hence, it only makes sense that, while the tree was 'a who' that imparted to Adam and Eve false knowledge, and thereby <u>propagated</u> their **blindness** (while they <u>thought</u> they had *true sight*), 'the Who' referred to in Genesis 3.11 is Jesus (i.e. a true Prophet speaking for Christ), and it is He that - after a time lapse from when they first started receiving counsel from Satan's false prophets - gave true spiritual sight, revealing to Adam and Eve their mistakes for which they felt great shame and figurative nakedness. And without recognizing the time lapse, 'the tree of knowledge' Seems to represent true knowledge and true sight, which is the COmplete Opposite of what Satan's poisonous tree of false knowledge actually represents; noting again that this was Moses' intention, as 'false prophets who like to <u>play God</u> and <u>dictate policy from behind the scenes</u>' would have surely <u>destroyed</u> or <u>altered</u> the story of Adam and Eve, as it opposes the supremacy and authority that these type of men practice in the name of God (or any other false god).

F) Adam and Eve's nakedness is **NOT literal nakedness**, but rather **figurative nakedness**. Note here that, if it is hard to believe that Adam and Eve's nakedness is figurative, consider that we <u>still</u> use the figurative terminology in today's world '<u>He showed his **ass** (or nakedness)</u>' to mean '<u>He</u>

<u>acted like a jerk'</u>; which <u>also</u> describes Adam and Eve's nakedness in one word. So Adam and Eve's figurative nakedness represents 'ignorance of God's <u>true version</u> of good and evil', or 'ignorance of the <u>true persona</u> of God'. That is, 'nakedness = ignorance'. Figurative nakedness is used to <u>CONVEY the image</u> of someone 'proudly (i.e., without shame) walking around <u>as if</u> they are clothed, only to look down in an instant to <u>see</u> (<u>as if</u> gaining sight after being <u>blind</u>) that they are in fact <u>naked</u> in front of a <u>crowd of clothed people</u>, thereby feeling great shame'. And this <u>shame</u> and <u>embarrassment</u> of having to 'swallow your pride' is what people feel when they have <u>insisted</u> that they were <u>highly knowledgeable</u> on a subject, only to suddenly find out that their 'supposed knowledge' is actually nonsense, ignorance, and man-made dribble. Remember, the entire set up for this fable centers around 'a tree that gives knowledge', and ignorance is the opposite of knowledge. Thus, metaphorically speaking, we can write the equations:

nakedness = ignorance

and

being <u>truly</u> clothed = hearing and <u>conceding to</u> true knowledge

So it is important to note here that, Adam and Eve <u>received sight</u> (actually 'partial sight') by <u>hearing true knowledge</u> and then <u>immediately</u> saying <u>to themselves</u> (<u>silently</u> of course) 'Satan deceived me'</u>, yet by <u>not conceding to</u> that true knowledge (i.e. by putting on fig leaves of man-made knowledge, see 'G'), Adam and Eve were <u>never truly clothed</u>. That is, they heard the words of <u>true knowledge</u>, yet <u>never fully embraced</u> that knowledge (which is represented by 'eating the fruit of the Tree of Life'), thereby never being <u>truly clothed</u>. Think here of how people hear the <u>simple</u> words 'love your neighbor <u>as</u> Yourself', yet practice hidden enslavement of their neighbor (something they would <u>never do to themselves</u>), thereby never fully embracing the true knowledge of Christ. So while 'clothes' (such as 'fig leaves' and 'the <u>garment</u> used by Shem and Japheth in Genesis 9.23') may temporarily cover over a person's nakedness (or ignorance), 'true clothing' (sometimes referring to such things as 'wedding garments' in Matthew 22.11, or 'washed, clean robes' in Revelation 22.14) is only worn by those fully embracing, conceding to, and believing in the true knowledge revealed by Christ.

Additionally, if we are to think logically about our inherited <u>perception</u> of Adam and Eve, then 'literal nakedness suddenly becoming sinful after eating from the tree of knowledge' does <u>not</u> make any sense, as most people would consider Adam and Eve to be A) <u>married</u>, and B) the <u>only people on earth</u> at the time when they ate from the tree of knowledge. So if (literal) nakedness was supposedly <u>not sinful</u> <u>before</u> they ate from the tree, then how would nakedness be sinful <u>after</u> they ate from the tree, considering that they were a <u>married couple</u> with <u>no one else even there</u> to see their supposed literal nakedness? Therefore, Adam and Eve's nakedness (not making any sense as being <u>literal</u> nakedness) is '<u>ignorance</u> of true right and true wrong', and them being '<u>unashamed</u> of their nakedness' (Genesis 2.25) means that 'they <u>proudly</u>, arrogantly, and boldly embraced this <u>lack of knowledge</u>', with nakedness again be used to convey the idea that 'they blindly walked around <u>as if</u> they were <u>fully clothed</u>, while actually being <u>stark naked</u>'; noting that our religious leaders also <u>proudly</u>, arrogantly, and boldly embrace their lack of knowledge, <u>thinking</u> that they too are 'fully clothed'. Also consider the fact that, if 'God is <u>unchanging'</u> (Malachi 3.6), then it is impossible for Him to have created Adam and Eve in 'a non-

sinful state of (literal) nakedness', then changed to make nakedness sinful. I.e., if people who misinterpret the story of Adam and Eve believe that 'in the very beginning God created Adam and Eve naked and sanctified, approving of their nakedness', then how could an 'unchanging God' suddenly change and disapprove of their nakedness? Or, how can nakedness be non-sinful one minute, then the next minute be sinful, if we truly believe that 'God is the same unchanging God yesterday, today, and forever'? So again, it is impossible for the story of Adam and Eve to make any sense if their nakedness is taken as literal, and the preceding disproves and debunks the nonsensical conventional misinterpretation that 'Adam and Eve suddenly realized that literal nakedness is inherently evil'; which is exactly what Satan wants us to think, thereby contributing to the desolation of our human sexuality.

Furthermore, it should be recognized that, by Genesis 2.25 saying 'Adam and Eve were naked, and were not ashamed of their nakedness', Moses is conveying their pride, vanity, and arrogance; of course remembering that pride and vanity, and ultimately the envy of God's supreme authority, are all hallmarks of Satan, and why the 3rd part of the 1st Commandment specifies that 'vain and arrogant people will speak lies in the name of God'. So it is pride and vanity that made Adam and Eve unashamed of their nakedness (i.e., ignorance), figuratively walking around as if they were blind and not able to see that they had no clothes on. Therefore, with the understanding that 'spiritual sight' does not necessarily imply 'being humble' or 'being truly clothed' (and is many times only 'partial sight'), we can write the equation:

pride and vanity = spiritual blindness = spiritual nakedness

Note here that **spiritual deafness** - i.e., 'not being able to hear and understand the truth' - is **always** implied with spiritual blindness. So consequently, if you are spiritually blind, then you walk around as if you are wearing clothing (or knowledge), while you are unknowingly walking around naked (or ignorant). Hence - noting that 'God hides from the proud and vain' (1 Peter 5.5 and Matthew 11.25), meaning you can't see Him or His true knowledge - pride and vanity conveys both spiritual blindness and spiritual nakedness, not being able to see what is true right and true wrong, and proudly, vainly, arrogantly, boldly, and blindly embracing that ignorance with no shame at all, as if being a blind man who can't see that he has **no** clothes on, yet **still** walking around (with **no** shame) thinking he is clothed. As Jeremiah 6.15 says 'They (i.e., the prophets and the priests, among others) were not at all **ashamed**, nor did they know how to blush'. So the proud and vain man shamelessly thinks that he is 'clothed' in the **knowledge** of righteousness, yet he is actually <u>ignorant</u> (i.e., <u>naked</u>), haven blindly eaten Satan's poisonous fruit of false righteousness. As Obadiah 1.3 says, 'The pride of a man's heart will deceive him'. Therefore, the <u>proud</u> and <u>vain</u> man, envious of God's supremacy, ends up being tricked or deceived into 'being more like Satan', while believing that he is 'being more like God'... all because he is <u>spiritually blind</u> and <u>can't see</u> that he has in fact eaten Satan's 'fruit of <u>corruption</u>' that he has so cleverly **disguised** as 'fruit of righteousness'. But the **proud** and **vain** man, who is proudly **naked** just like Adam and Eve, ultimately feels great **shame** and **embarrassment** when he is given sight by Jesus, thereby <u>realizing</u> (i.e., seeing) that 'he is walking around, **figuratively** wearing <u>not even a **stitch**</u> of clothing'.

G After Adam and Eve receive sight - i.e., after they are told by Jesus that they are figuratively or spiritually naked, blindly believing 'Satan's false version of good and evil' is actually 'God's true version of good and evil' - they feel great **shame** or <u>embarrassment</u>, and decide to <u>cover over their ignorance</u> (i.e., spiritual nakedness) with man-made knowledge or lies. This man-made knowledge (or lies) is represented by **fig leaves**. I.e., the **fig leaves** symbolize 'man's pathetic attempt, after hearing the truth based on <u>indisputable evidence</u>, to immediately <u>cover over</u> his ignorance so that his <u>pride</u> (in addition to money and power) stays intact'; understanding that 'receiving sight', in many cases is a sort of *partial sight* that gives people a <u>mere glimmer</u> of their ignorance, which they <u>quickly</u> shut <u>out and</u> cover over with fiq leaves, thereby never being truly clothed. So it is important here to realize that, even though it was Jesus' true knowledge that gave sight (or more accurately, partial sight) to Adam and Eve, making them feel shameful over their figurative nakedness, it does not mean that Adam and Eve were humbly willing to 'openly accept that true knowledge'. That is, Adam and Eve may have 'heard the words of Christ, thereby immediately knowing and realizing to a certain extent (i.e., 'Satan deceived me') true good and true evil', but they were not willing to accept His correction (i.e., to truly believe and **follow** His words, thereby 'putting on <u>true clothing</u>'); hence the need for 'fig leaves of man-made wisdom' to try and justify themselves. This is why Jesus told 'The Parable of the Sower'. Many people, such as the Pharisees and Scribes, heard the words of Christ (i.e., the true version of good and evil) and realized (with a sort of partial sight) their ignorance and nakedness (which of course was why the religious leaders wanted to kill Him). But because of course they had already 'sworn oaths' that 'their <u>knowledge</u> (i.e., the <u>doctrine</u> of Judaism at that time, which had become a <u>false god</u>) was <u>absolutely</u> true, infallible knowledge', they would not truly believe, in order to thereby put on true clothing, opting instead to place *fig leaves* over their nakedness, all to ensure that their control, power, supremacy, money, authority, glory, etc. (i.e. 'the <u>cares</u> and <u>riches</u> of this world' in Matthew 13.22) that <u>came with</u> 'swearing allegiance to their false god' stayed intact. And so this is why Jesus' fundamental message was <u>not</u> just to '<u>hear</u> His words', but <u>most importantly</u> to '<u>believe</u> and **<u>follow</u>** His words in order to gain eternal life' (like the wise man in Matthew 7.24 who 'built his house on rock'). Therefore, Adam and Eve heard Jesus' words thereby 'knowing (at least partially) true good and true evil', silently admitting to themselves (hearing God's voice in their hearts) that 'Satan deceived them', but were not yet willing to 'truly believe, follow, embrace, and concede to those words (or put on true clothing) in order to gain eternal life'. This means 'the **tunics of skin** that God clothed Adam and Eve with' was more of a <u>reiteration</u> of 'Adam and Eve simply <u>hearing</u> the true knowledge of God'; noticing here that, Adam and Eve did not Willingly Want to put on the tunics of skin, as opposed to the fig leaves that 'they put on <u>themselves</u>'. Note also here that 'tunics of skin' essentially represents the <u>1st mention</u> of the <u>New</u> Covenant, as 'God writes (as we live our lives) His laws on our hearts and puts them in our minds', but, just like Adam and Eve, it is up to us **whether** or **not** we 'willingly concede to those laws' or 'harden our hearts to those laws'. Furthermore, this essentially means that the **New Covenant** has been **in** effect 'from the beginning'. So, because God knew that Adam and Eve would (in the future) continue to harden their hearts to His laws, not truly believing and fully conceding to the true knowledge of Jesus, God did **not** want them to 'live forever'. Realize here that, as Adam and Eve essentially knew 2

versions of good and evil, they (being trained in 'the ways of Satan') would never truly concede to Jesus' true version of good and evil; especially after being absolute rulers with slaves, thereby always wanting and having the **inherent** tendency to **manipulate** Jesus' true knowledge for their own **glory**, just as today's religious leaders do. Again, this is the reason why God sent them away from the Tree of Life, essentially 'hiding It from them'. That is, God essentially hid the Tree of Life (or 'God guarded the way to the Tree of Life') so that it's true knowledge would **not** be changed, thereby being **preserved**. Hence, this ('the Tree of Life being <u>hidden</u>', especially from rulers) is a <u>direct reference</u> to '<u>Jesus speaking in</u> hidden language or parables' and 'the Bible (such as this parable itself) being written in code', thereby having the true knowledge of Christ unknowingly preserved and passed down (by of course the blind men which that knowledge is opposed to). And when Jesus returns, His hidden knowledge will be <u>revealed</u> (i.e., <u>the apocalypse</u>), thereby showing us 'the <u>way</u> to the Tree of Life' so that we may be **truly** clothed. As a side note here, 'the man Without the wedding garment on' in 'The Parable of the Wedding Feast' (see Matthew 22.1-14) was cast into outer darkness (i.e., hell) because 'the wedding garment' represented 'truly believing and conceding to the words of Christ', thereby being 'truly clothed'. Therefore, when Jesus returns for 'the <u>marriage supper</u> of the Lamb' (see Revelation 19.9), those <u>not</u> willing to 'put on wedding garments' (truly <u>conceding to</u> Christ's words) - or those still trying to wear man-made garments, such as fiq leaves - will also be 'bound and cast into outer darkness'. Note also here that, Revelation 19.8 makes it <u>clear</u> that the 'wedding garments worn by those at the marriage supper of the Lamb' (referred to as 'fine linen') represent 'the righteous acts of those conceding to the words of Christ'.

So we must recognize that many people (especially leaders) in today's world are not willing to 'put on true clothing' (because of pride), opting to wear fig leaves instead. That is, in today's world, we see the exact same occurrence as in the story of Adam and Eve. Vain and arrogant men - who of course have the tendency to <u>convince themselves</u> that 'they can't be wrong' - receive 'a small nugget of knowledge or <u>indisputable evidence</u>' (i.e., partial sight by which they <u>silently realize to themselves</u> that 'they have been <u>deceived</u> by Satan'), with this threatening to 'reveal their ignorance', and instead of embracing that true knowledge, they immediately justify 'the way that they have always done something' with false man-made knowledge (i.e., *lies*), covering their *figurative nakedness* with *figurative fig leaves*. Think of how many proud and arrogant men in leadership positions (i.e., politicians, CEOs, etc.) will never concede to being wrong, no matter what, even when it is so obvious (due to indisputable evidence) that they have ignorantly misled the people. Think of how many corporations, when on the verge of bankruptcy, will <u>lie</u> and 'turn it around' to say that they are actually profitable, when the whole company is really falling apart around them. Think of how when A) a business finds out that their product is defective, **B)** designers find out their system or plan is faulty, **C)** a corporation finds out their food is harmful to our health, D a politician sees an unjust or unfair policy, or E a doctor finds out that his <u>drug</u> or <u>procedure</u> is actually <u>harmful</u> (after asserting that it was <u>helpful</u>), they <u>cover it up</u> with manmade lies only to not lose their **pride** or **profits**, **justifying** these lies by saying things like 'It's too **big to fail**, or 'People will lose jobs', or 'Families will suffer', when in reality these things will all be compounded when they are 'kicked down the road' and covered up. In this respect, men will boldly place 'pathetic little fig leaves' (i.e., man-made lies, false wisdom, or false information) over their

obvious *nakedness*, bluffing with lies in order to control minds and make people believe that 'their pathetic lies are really truth'; yet the real truth will eventually come out. Hence, 'the **fig leaves** from the fable of Adam and Eve' are the lies that men concoct, after seeing (usually only partially) the error of their ways (or realizing that they are *figuratively naked*), in an attempt to perpetually justify themselves so that they will <u>not</u> incur any <u>shame</u>, or <u>lose any money or power</u>. The <u>fig leaves</u> represent man's reluctance, even after seeing and realizing that things have gone wrong under their command, to humbly concede to true knowledge, thereby putting on true clothing. The fig leaves represent the fact that, even though Adam and Eve realized in their hearts that Jesus' knowledge was true knowledge, their pride (remembering that receiving sight does not necessarily equate to humility) kept them from 'putting on (as with clothing) that true knowledge', saying to themselves 'There is no way we are that ignorant' (of course then 'hardening their hearts'). But the fact is that Satan's deceptions are Sadistic, making people proudly believe for their entire lifetime that 'his lies are the truth'. And even when their **ignorance** only partially reveals itself, they quickly place **fig leaves** over their ignorance saying 'I could **not** have been that ignorant for an **entire** lifetime'. Jesus says in Revelation 16.15 "Behold, I am coming as a thief (i.e., sneaking back into humanity unnoticed). Blessed is he who watches, and keeps his garments (i.e., true clothes), lest he walk naked and they see his shame." Thus, when Jesus returns to <u>reveal His **knowledge**</u> (i.e., 'the **apocalypse**'), it will expose our religious leaders' nakedness. And of course, as they have not 'kept their garments', conceding to His true knowledge, we will see their **shame**, for there will **no longer** be pathetic man-made **fig leaves** (as they have used for countless centuries) with which they can use to cover over their obvious ignorance (i.e., figurative nakedness).

So to <u>summarize</u> and 'connect all the dots', Adam and Eve were chosen by God to rule over (i.e., 'tend and keep') the nation or tribe of Eden. God, speaking to the hearts (or true consciences) of Adam and Eve, told them not to consume the knowledge of Satan's false prophets; who were represented by a tree that produces poisonous or bad fruit of knowledge, disguised of course as good fruit. And since Satan's false prophets (disguised as true Prophets) spoke lies in the name of God (i.e., broke the 3rd part of the 1st Commandment), and thereby redefined God's persona into Satan's persona, Adam and Eve's minds became warped (by the instilling of a false conscience), and their hearts hardened to the true voice of God (i.e., their true conscience), getting farther away from God, while thinking that they were getting *closer* to God. I.e., they were <u>disobeying God</u>, while *truly believing* that they were **obeying God**. As Isaiah 47.10 says "Your (false) wisdom and your (false) knowledge have warped you". And so ultimately, under the guidance of Satan's false prophets, Adam and Eve began to rule unjustly over their people, oppressing and enslaving some, while granting authority and supremacy to the elite, thereby causing dissension, desolation, and violence among the people; again realizing that, because Adam and Eve were listening to false prophets who spoke lies in the name of God (i.e., they broke the 3rd part of the 1st Commandment, and thereby disguised **false** knowledge as **true** knowledge), Adam and Eve (their minds being warped) did all these things believing that it was in accordance with the will of God, and in service to God. They did all these things truly believing that

'their injustice was actually justice'. In other words, Adam and Eve thought that their 'unjust practices' of oppression and slavery over their people' were God-like, and thereby just. Adam and Eve thought that their 'abuse of power' and 'drunkenness on power' was somehow 'the way God would act'. And so Adam and Eve thought that they were advancing God's agenda, while actually they were blindly advancing (as 'unwitting puppets') Satan's agenda to 'trick humanity into destroying itself'. It is important here to notice a pattern or precedent 'from the very beginning' in which Satan's false prophets don't rule directly, but rather indirectly as hidden kings, influencing minds and consciences, and redefining 'true good and true evil' so that it is ultimately Satan who rules (i.e., deceives) nations from behind the scenes... and we don't even realize it. This is a pattern repeated to this day, with many of our politicians and judges consulting religious leaders, or having been raised under their <u>influence</u>, making our religious leaders (and ultimately Satan) the <u>actual (**hidden**) rulers</u>. I.e., for thousands of years, kings and rulers have 'asked advice' from someone presumed to have a divine connection, saying 'What does God say', with the false prophet (or wise man, sorcerer, magician, soothsayer, snake charmer, medium, diviner, priest, priestess, etc.) saying 'God says this'... which God never said. You will recall that <u>Jeroboam</u>, before deciding to make and worship two golden calves, 'asked advice' (see 1 Kings 12.28), making it clear that Jeroboam was persuaded to do evil, probably by someone fluent in the word of God, such as one of Satan's false prophets. Thus, we must learn to look at Adam and Eve in a different light, as people who acted as <u>ruthless</u>, unjust rulers, and then finally realized the error of their ways, feeling great shame. And to realize our own **blindness** to 'what is truly evil in our present time', we must ultimately recognize that 'the fall of man' - i.e., Adam and Eve's blind ambition to SUPremacy over others, while truly believing that their supremacy is Godlike - was Catalyzed by false prophets who broke the 3rd part of the 1st Commandment by 'speaking lies in the name of God, and swearing by heaven', thereby ultimately creating a false persona of God. And it is those same false prophets who (through their misinterpretations of Adam and Eve) keep humanity blindly repeating the sin of Adam and Eve over and over again. Finally, it is also important to note that, by not understanding the figurative language in the story of Adam and Eve, we have <u>simultaneously wrongly demonized sexuality</u>, while <u>obscuring the real sin</u> of 'people <u>enslaving</u> and **oppressing** other people, and **justifying** that enslavement and oppression (which usually starts

Since we now know that Satan <u>cloaked</u> or <u>disguised</u> his 'words of <u>false</u> righteousness' as 'words of <u>true</u> righteousness' in this story of Adam and Eve, we should therefore realize that <u>God also cloaks or disguises His true intentions</u>; remembering here that Jesus spoke in <u>parables</u> which we, <u>underestimating</u> the <u>simplicity</u> of the parables, and believing that 'we are <u>smarter</u> than the <u>simple-minded</u> people of 2000 years ago', <u>naïvely think</u> that we <u>understand</u>, while in truth, we probably understand His parables <u>less</u>, being <u>detached</u> from the time period and surroundings of 2000 years ago. So Jesus used <u>parables</u> to <u>purposefully hide</u> things from false prophets and people doing evil; both <u>past</u> and <u>present</u>. And, as already noted with 'The Parable of Adam and Eve', God keeps his <u>true</u>

with mental and spiritual deception) as being righteous and God-like'.

message hidden so that blind religious leaders, false prophets, kings, governmental leaders, etc., will not destroy it, but actually unknowingly pass it on to future generations; remembering that 'the king destroyed Jeremiah's writings' in chapter 36, verse 23, which shows that God's word will be destroyed if leaders perceive that it challenges their authority. This ultimately means that the Bible is

coded so that <u>blind</u> religious leaders and false prophets (or <u>anyone</u> else whose authority is threatened) cannot interpret (or 'see') what is written right in front of their eyes; realizing here that, if the Bible was <u>not</u> coded, then <u>there would be no need for the apocalypse</u> to 'reveal hidden (or 'coded') knowledge'. Since the true meaning of biblical language is therefore still hidden, our religious leaders, as they have for thousands of years, take all of the 'sexual words' like nakedness, lust, lewdness, fornication, and adultery at 'face value', interpreting these words literally, when in fact they are figurative, drawing parallels between 'the attraction a man has to a woman (i.e., lust)', and 'the attraction a man has to money, power, authority, and supremacy'; noting that these are the 'lusts of the *flesh'* referred to many times in the New Testament. And so these 'words of sexual imagery' are many times written about people (considered 'God's bride') who, by coveting money, power, authority, and supremacy, were guilty of 'fornicating with Satan and having intimate relations with Satan, thereby committing <u>adultery</u> against God' (see Section 17). But since the religious leaders are spiritually blind and can't read the true meaning of these words, they cannot perceive that these words are actually written about them. In other words, our religious leaders, having an intimate relationship with Satan, are 'the fornicators', using the Bible for control and power (i.e., supremacy), hence they can't 'see' that the word 'fornicator' is referring to 'someone seeking control and power'; **nOt** 'someone who is overly indulgent in sexual activity'. So in truth, we have lost sight of the fact that 'sex is of the <u>nature</u> of <u>God'</u> (or 'of the <u>natural world</u>'), while '<u>control and power</u> is of the <u>nature</u> of <u>man and</u> Satan' (or 'of the man-made world'), remembering that when Satan tempted Jesus in the desert, he tempted with 'the <u>control</u> and <u>power</u> over nations', <u>not sex</u>. We must wonder, do the religious leaders <u>not</u> think that <u>God is smart enough to 'cloak His words</u>', when they, as mere humans, are smart enough to **'cloak their hidden desires** for <u>control</u>, <u>power</u>, and the <u>enslavement</u> of their fellow man with <u>false</u> words of liberty and freedom'? Therefore, if God did not cloak or code His words, the people in power would have destroyed them long ago. And if Jesus did not cloak or code His words with parables and figurative language, He would not have been able to speak openly against the religious leaders (i.e., 'cutting the religious leaders off and casting them out' in Matthew 5.30; see Section 2), who would have had Him <u>arrested immediately</u>. So ultimately by cloaking or coding His words, God has been <u>secretly</u> gathering the hidden kings (our religious leaders) together to be overcome by the Lamb at the Battle of Armageddon. Thus, it is essential to understand that, by the religious leaders misinterpreting the sexual imagery in the Bible as *literal* and not *figurative*, they have blindly and unknowingly caused both A) the attempted sterilization and consequential desolation of humanity's sexuality (see Section 16), and B) the widespread violence and oppression that is a product of their own idolatrous practices. Again, we have lost sight of the fact that it is violence and oppression (the products of supremacy) that are the true offenses and impurities before God, not sexuality. Think about it. It was because of violence that God flooded the earth and destroyed mankind in the days of Noah (Genesis

6.13), <u>not sexuality</u>. It was because of the <u>violence of rape</u> that God *destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah*, <u>not</u> because of <u>consensual</u> <u>sex</u> (Genesis 19.4-9). And 'in order to <u>kill off</u> all of the <u>violent men of war</u>', God kept the Israelites in the desert **40 years** (Joshua 5.6). So to reiterate, <u>sexuality</u> is of <u>God</u>, while <u>control</u>, <u>power</u>, and <u>supremacy</u> - which <u>breeds</u> <u>violence</u> and <u>oppression</u> - is of <u>man and Satan</u>. And by the religious leaders <u>misinterpreting</u> biblical sexual language (i.e., words such as <u>nakedness</u>, <u>lust</u>, <u>lewdness</u>, <u>fornication</u>, and <u>adultery</u>) in their blind 'lust' for authority and supremacy, they have unknowingly <u>Caused</u> <u>both</u> 'widespread <u>desolation</u> and <u>bloodshed</u>', and 'the <u>defilement</u> of the true nature of our <u>sexuality</u>'; which consequently <u>defiles</u> the true <u>nature</u> and <u>persona</u> of both God and <u>Jesus</u>.

Now if you are still in disbelief that the Bible is coded, and in particular that A) Adam and Eve were actually unjust rulers over a figurative garden of people, and B) Adam and Eve's nakedness was purely figurative, then by understanding that the story of 'Noah's nakedness in his tent' is also a figurative story or parable - as it, like Adam and Eve, was also written by *Moses* - it will *verify* and *prove* the preceding (true) interpretations of the story of Adam and Eve; as **Noah** was **also** an **unjust ruler** over a figurative vineyard of people, and was also figuratively naked, not literally naked. In other words, like Adam and Eve, Noah also became an unjust ruler, and was also figuratively naked, or ignorant of 'God's true version of good and evil'; i.e., God's true persona. And like Adam and Eve, Noah also became **'drunk on <u>power</u> and <u>authority'</u>,** believing that his 'unjust, abusive practices of oppression and enslavement' were somehow 'God-like actions'; which he of course believed because Satan tricked him (just as he did Adam and Eve) into truly thinking that his false knowledge was true knowledge. And so, like the parable of Adam and Eve, and many other stories in the Bible containing sexual language (i.e., nakedness, fornication, and adultery), this parable about Noah has also been grossly misinterpreted, thereby casting a dark and demonizing shadow on human sexuality, while simultaneously belittling the true main idea: 'the evil of supremacy and subsequent abuse of authority', with the added (compared to Adam and Eve) message of 'the righteous being punished for standing up to the supremacy and unjust practices of unrighteous leaders'. Hence, it cannot be emphasized enough how skilled Satan is at 'breathing <u>false intentions</u> into Scripture and <u>false life</u> into names of the past'. And this <u>well known</u>, extremely misunderstood parable is a **powerful example** of Satan's ability to 'deceive us without us even knowing it', making it seem as though this story means the **exact opposite** of its true meaning, thereby again redefining good and evil, making 'what is evil', seem good, and vice versa, ultimately leading to the redefining of personas. From Genesis 9.19-27, the story of 'Noah's nakedness in his tent' is as follows.

After the flood, Noah and his 3 sons <u>populated</u> the whole earth. Then Noah became a farmer, planted a <u>vineyard</u>, got <u>drunk</u> on the wine, and became '<u>naked in his tent</u>'. Ham, Noah's <u>younger</u> son, <u>saw</u> Noah's nakedness and told his 2 brothers, Shem and Japheth. But Ham's 2 brothers took a <u>garment</u>, laid it on both their shoulders, and <u>went backward</u> and <u>covered the</u> <u>nakedness of their father</u>; turning their faces away to <u>not see their father's nakedness</u>. So Noah

awoke from his <u>drunkenness</u>, knowing what Ham had done, and thus <u>cursed Ham's son</u> 'Canaan' to be the **servant** of Shem and Japheth; thereby also **blessing** Shem and Japheth.

To reiterate, we must understand that, like Adam and Eve, and many other accounts in the Bible, this story is a <u>fable</u> or <u>parable</u> using <u>figurative</u> language, **not** literal language. If this story is read literally, then asking a few basic questions proves the literal interpretation to be nonsense. A) Why would Ham tell his 2 brothers, as if he was a five-year-old, that 'Noah was naked in his own tent', as if it would matter if someone was physically naked in their own tent? B) Why would Ham even want to see 'some naked, wrinkly old man' in the first place, as this is something most people would want to 'un-see' and forget about? And C), why would Noah curse his son over merely seeing him drunk and without clothes on, which is rather petty when taken literally? So again, this story does not make sense if it is read literally; it only makes sense if it is read figuratively. The figurative language in this story is interpreted as follows. Remembering of course that 'a vineyard = people' (see Matthew 21.33-46, and Isaiah 5.7), and that the set-up for this parable is that 'Noah and his 3 sons populated the earth with people' thereby placing Noah and his sons in an authoritative position as elders, the idea that 'Noah planted a vineyard' is figuratively conveying that 'Noah became a ruler over a group of people', just as Adam and Eve, and so was not an actual farmer. Recalling also that 'fruit' = 'anything and everything that people produce', by this parable saying that 'Noah got drunk on the wine (i.e., fruit of the vine) of his vineyard', it is actually saying that 'Noah used his people as slaves', and was 'intoxicated on having them labor for him'; 'people's labor' being 'the fruit of Noah's vineyard'. So, not getting drunk on actual wine from grapes, Noah (using the same figurative language that we still use today) was in fact drunk on the power and supremacy that he felt by enslaving and oppressing his people. Ham recognizing that Noah, his father, was acting 'proudly, ignorantly, arrogantly, and of course nakedly' -'blew the whistle' on his father's abuse of power to his 2 brothers; i.e., Ham spoke Jesus's words of the knowledge of true *right* (or *good*) and true *wrong* (or *evil*). But the 2 brothers, still *completely blind*, not even 'seeing Noah's nakedness', sided with Noah, therefore backsliding into error and unrighteousness. I.e., the 2 brothers (noticing it does not say 'walked') 'went spiritually backward, <u>blindly covering up Noah's ignorance</u> (or <u>nakedness</u>)'; also noting that 'the <u>garment</u> which the 2 brothers placed on Noah' was 'a man-made piece of clothing', just like Adam and Eve's fig leaves, which represented 'man-made false knowledge or lies' that would COVEr over and justify Noah's ignorance. And the 2 brothers covered over Noah's ignorance, supporting their father's abuse of power and practices of enslavement, because it meant that they too would receive power, authority, and ultimately their own slaves. So basically, when Noah heard from the 2 brothers 'what Ham had done' - which was actually **<u>standing up</u>** for **justice** and **righteousness** - he 'awoke from his drunkenness', gaining enough partial sight, just like Adam and Eve, to realize (silently to himself) his own ignorance, thereby feeling shame. But, protecting his pride and ego, and conveying to Shem and Japheth that 'they were right to cover over his nakedness', Noah cursed Ham's son to be the slave of Shem and Japheth, thereby blessing the 2 Unrighteous brothers (and of course perpetuating their blindness). Note here that this sets up the <u>precedent</u> of 'the unrighteous prospering', with the

<u>righteous</u> being <u>enslaved</u> by the <u>unrighteous</u>, and being looked at as 'the ones who are actually doing evil'... a true case of Satan <u>redefining</u> good and evil. And it must also be noted that this essentially documents the <u>start</u> of 'the good ole boy system', with Shem and Japheth blindly covering over the ignorance of their <u>elder</u>, then being <u>rewarded</u> for their actions; which propagates this 'way of doing business' into the succeeding generations. Hence, we must recognize that, from the time of Noah until today, the unrighteous have <u>prospered</u> (by of course glorifying, blessing, and covering for each other), thereby <u>projecting</u> their actions as being righteous and God-like, while simultaneously portraying and condemning the righteous as being <u>unrighteous</u>... just as they did to Jesus.

If we can understand the *figurative language* of this parable of Noah's nakedness, then we will come to the realization that the magnitude and gravity of this story is highly understated. This story - in which Noah proudly practices supremacy and abuses power as a ruler, then *curses* the younger son (Ham) who righteously stands up to him, while **blessing** the 2 older sons who covered over his (Noah's) evil - sets up the idea that 'those who bow to Satan's temptations will be <u>rewarded</u> in this lifetime'; remembering that, if Jesus bowed to Satan's will in the desert, He too would be 'rewarded with all the kingdoms of the world' (Matthew 4.8-9). Note here that, as 'God sends His rain on both the just and the unjust' (Matthew 5.45) - think here of how Jesus, 'the good Carpenter', would do the same job for both good and bad clients - and as 'God blesses those who curse Him' (Matthew 5.44), 'prosperity is therefore **not** a measure of being **God-like**, or being close to God', as many people **wrongly think**; understanding that **Satan actually USES prosperity** to keep people **complacent** to his lies, being seemingly at peace, yet actually living with great internal conflict. Additionally, it should be noted that the story of 'Noah's nakedness in his tent' sets up the same scenario of Jesus, 'the Younger' at 30 years old, standing up to the elders, with the elders, who had all the money and wealth, portraying Jesus as evil, and cursing Him (just as Ham, the younger son, was cursed) in order to secure their continued ability to <u>rule</u> and <u>enslave</u> others; just as Noah and the 2 older sons wanted to continue their practices of oppression and enslavement. In other words, Jesus (just as Ham did to Noah) 'blew the whistle on the evil practices of the religious leaders'. And so in order to proudly maintain their authority, supremacy, and glory, they turned it around and 'placed fig leaves over their nakedness', cursing Jesus, and saying that 'Jesus was the One practicing evil'. Hence it is extremely important in this story to recognize 'the redefinition of good and evil by Noah' - which is played out in the condemning of Christ, 'the good' making Ham out to be unrighteous, thereby cursing him, with Noah reinforcing the idea that 'his Satan*like* actions were actually **God-like**', and, if his sons <u>sided</u> with his Satan-like actions, they were to be **rewarded** (of course making them believe that 'they did **right**').

So ultimately we must think that, if for thousands of years we have <u>mistaken</u> Noah as <u>righteous</u> and <u>Ham as unrighteous</u> (i.e., we have '<u>Swapped their identities'</u>) due to our inability to correctly interpret the Bible, then is it possible that we will <u>make the same mistake</u> when Jesus returns, repeating history and allowing our religious leaders and elders, as they did 2000 years ago, to <u>portray Jesus as evil and unrighteous</u> so that they can attempt to <u>cover their nakedness</u> with *fig leaves* and <u>man-made</u> <u>garments</u>, justifying their ignorance to not incur any **shame**? Is it possible that our religious leaders and

elders (just as Noah did to Ham) will <u>curse Jesus</u> when He returns (claiming that He is <u>not</u> the <u>true</u> Savior) because of their *pride*, *vanity*, *spiritual blindness*, and (above all) their reluctance to relinquish the authority and supremacy that has been granted to them by Satan? Therefore, this parable of Noah's nakedness should ultimately serve as an example of how we associate a certain persona with a particular name, when in fact we had their persona completely wrong, backwards and **opposite** of their *true* persona. I.e., this parable is an example of Satan's ability to **redefine** personas such as God's persona, Jesus' persona, or any other person's persona in history. While Noah was 'perfect and just in the time leading up to the flood' (Genesis 6.9), he was eventually corrupted by Satan, and is therefore <u>not</u> the <u>model of perfection</u> that we thought he was. Conversely, Ham has been given the persona of being evil (or at least perverted), when in reality Ham's persona is one of justice and righteousness. And so if history and generations of people, led by Satan of course, can by gross misinterpretation redefine Ham as a pervert when he was actually just and righteous, and redefine Noah as just when he was actually unjust - thereby essentially creating in our minds 'a false Ham' and 'a false Noah' that never actually existed - then we can be quite certain that Satan has also redefined the personas of Jesus and God, essentially creating in our minds 'a false Jesus' and 'a false (capitol G) God' that never actually existed. Again, Satan's best trick is to 'disguise himself as God' so that we blindly follow (just as Adam, Eve, and Noah) 'a false version of God', and 'a false version of righteousness'. Note here that, 'making people think that he is God and speaking for God' is Satan's best trick, not 'making people think that he never existed', as not having 'an evil being in <u>existence</u> to play off of' would <u>not</u> allow Satan the ability to '<u>redefine</u> good and evil', thereby <u>redefining God's true persona</u>. Thus, by creating <u>a false persona</u> of God, Satan gets his unrighteous, Satan-like followers (who think they are righteous and God-like) to condemn and curse the truly righteous, innocent, and God-like (i.e., Ham and Jesus), while exalting and blessing themselves and their followers; with this parable of Noah's nakedness being a powerful example of these injustices, as it has been hidden from our minds for thousands of years, being cloaked or coded in figurative language. Furthermore, just as in the parable of Adam and Eve, by our blind religious leaders misinterpreting the figurative language concerning **Noah's nakedness**, we have (for thousands of years) wrongly demonized and condemned 'physical nakedness and sexuality', while simultaneously obscuring the real sin of 'people enslaving and oppressing other people, and blindly justifying that enslavement and oppression as being righteous and God-like'; of course thereby creating and propagating among the multitudes <u>a false persona of God</u> (which is <u>a false god</u>, or Satan) that condemns people for the <u>natural</u> sexual ambition that the one true God *preprogrammed* and *hardwired* them to have in the first place (see Section 16).

And so we must recognize that, as people such as Adam, Eve, Noah, and 'the <u>false prophets</u> who <u>advised</u>

Adam and Eve' were surely <u>exalting</u> the name of God, while <u>simultaneously</u> <u>blindly</u> <u>hating</u> God (as in,

Part <u>2</u> of the 1st Commandment) by <u>enslaving</u> and <u>oppressing</u> His people, <u>those who speak blasphemy</u>

do so in a <u>holy, reverent</u>, and <u>respectful</u> way, with words of <u>love</u>, <u>caring</u>, and <u>righteousness</u>.

Blasphemy (implied in this text as being 'against the Holy Spirit') can be defined as 'speaking words that oppose God'. But, as seen with Adam and Eve, Satan disguises himself as God, thereby getting people to blindly speak blasphemy, while believing that they are 'speaking words of honor and worship'. I.e., Jesus says in Matthew 15.8 'Your words <u>honor</u> God, but your hearts are actually <u>far away</u>'. So blasphemy is 'reverently using (i.e., 'taking') God's name for deception', not 'saying God's name in a disrespectful way'; noticing that Part 3 of the 1st Commandment (or to stay with convention, 'the 2nd Commandment') says 'take', not 'say'. Saying God's name in a profane and derogatory way (i.e., how saying 'God damn' is perceived in today's world) is **not** blasphemy, and is **not** breaking the 2nd Commandment; to think this is to 'insult the intelligence of God'. To 'take' is the same as to 'steal'. Hence, it is people 'blindly stealing God's name for Satan, and then unknowingly speaking reverent and holy lies that actually oppose God' who are the real blasphemers, and consequently the real idolaters; realizing of course that 'people who steal God's name' do so for motives of control and power, while 'people <u>saying</u> God's name in a <u>profane</u> or derogatory way' usually <u>do not</u> have the <u>same covetous</u> motives. Consider an identity thief in today's world. If an identity thief stole a person's name to get their possessions, would they <u>not</u> 'speak like, act like, and dress like that person in order to make their deception believable'? I.e., the identity thief surely would not speak bad things against the person whose identity they stole, but would rather exalt and 'build that name up'. So blasphemers, as they steal God's name and identity, and exalt God in order to steal us ('God's prized possessions'), are also identity thieves (or technically, they are acting for Satan, 'the first and original identity thief'), speaking words of *love*, *caring*, and *righteousness*, just as we would expect from Jesus, thereby easily gaining control over and enslaving humanity; i.e., 'stealing God's name in order to steal people and their fruits'. Thus it must be understood that God's name is hallowed (Matthew 6.9) and unspeakable for our protection and benefit; making the 1st and 2nd Commandments not 'all about God', 'for God's sole benefit', or 'to satisfy His ego', but rather 'all about us', as Satan's identity thieves, who speak reverent blasphemy by 'speaking the hallowed and unspeakable name of God', do so in order to deceive and enslave us, and to have unrighteous control over our minds and consciences for their own glory and the glory of Satan (not the glory of God). In other words, men who speak reverent blasphemy (Satan's identity thieves) do so in order to extort (i.e., steal) 'money, labor, time, dedication, and attention' from others who believe that their 'money, labor, time, dedication, and attention' is going to **God**; i.e., Satan's identity thieves, who speak reverent blasphemy, are **Satan's extortionists**. And so we must understand that, those who vainly break (in a holy and respectful way) the 2nd Commandment, speaking the hallowed and unspeakable name of God (i.e., speaking reverent **blasphemy**), are essentially 'playing the role of identity thief for Satan' so that he can pose as or impersonate Jesus and/or God, and thereby easily steal God's people (i.e. their minds and consciences); as Satan surely realizes that it is a lot easier to steal something if you are welcomed through the front door because you are 'clothed as a friend', than to have to sneak through the <u>window</u> because you are 'clothed as a thief'. Hence, once Satan can <u>easily</u> control our minds and true consciences by identifying himself as God, he proceeds to create 'many false personas of God' (i.e.,

'many false gods') which ultimately leads to the <u>self-destruction</u> of humanity, as we blindly *fight* and *kill* others to <u>protect</u> the false persona of God that Satan has so deviously name '<u>capital G</u>' 'God'; realizing here again why '<u>blasphemy</u> against the Holy Spirit is the <u>sin</u> that <u>will not be forgiven</u>' (Matthew 12.31), as it leads to the <u>destruction</u> of humanity.

One of the hardest concepts to fathom is that 'the **entire** multitude of religious leaders in the world today actually consists of *false prophets* and *false teachers*'. I.e., our religious leaders are the ones blindly 'playing the role' of Satan's identity thieves, blindly speaking reverent blasphemy, which they wrongly think is 'contributing to the kingdom of God', thereby blindly misleading the multitudes of people. But as hard as we think this might be to believe, this was the situation 2000 years ago. Just think of the scenario where 'people were <u>raised to believe</u> that the <u>well respected</u> Scribes, Pharisees, Chief Priests, and elders truly spoke for God'. Yet, Quite Confusingly, some 'lone Carpenter' starts saying that 'He is the true Voice of God', and everything that the religious leaders are saying (no matter how eloquent and respectful to God their words appear to be) is outright blasphemy, and the work of Satan. And so, understandably, the multitudes of people were confused, as Jesus and the religious leaders were in total opposition to one another, while simultaneously both speaking words that **exalted** God, and claiming to be 'doing the will of God and speaking the truth'. Yet, as we now know, <u>Jesus</u> - **not** 'the vast multitude of religious leaders (or 'majority voice') that everyone was raised to trust' - was the ONE Person actually speaking the truth, with the religious leaders speaking reverent blasphemy, 'honoring God in word only, while their hearts were far away and blindly in opposition to the one true God' (Matthew 15.8). In fact, this 'majority voice of false prophets, speaking lies in unison thereby misleading the majority of people, and of course opposing God's ONE true Prophet (or minority voice)' is a recurring theme throughout the Old Testament, remembering that Elijah, against 850 false prophets, said "I alone am left a prophet of the Lord" (1 Kings 18.22). So in many instances in the Bible we can say that 'the majority of people' went along with 'the majority **<u>Voice</u>** of false prophets'. Unfortunately, **God** is always the **minority voice** (i.e., Jesus and the true Prophets); realizing here that God's true Prophets always played the role of 'David fighting a **Goliath majority of false prophets'**. Hence we must realize that, by impersonating God's voice in our minds, effectively disguising his 'false conscience' as our own 'true conscience', Satan is able to make multitudes of false prophets truly believe that they are 'chosen by God as true Prophets', when in fact God never chose them. That is, false prophets, prompted by Satan, essentially chose themselves in order to propagate 'the version of God that best suits their agenda of obtaining earthly power and glory'. So if we read practically any book of the Old Testament, we will realize that, many false prophets, boldly and confidently claiming to be 'chosen by God' and therefore 'authorized to speak for God' (i.e., a *majority* or 'bully voice of false prophets'), were (for their own glory) deceiving and misleading the multitudes of people by proclaiming, week after week, a message that they insisted they had received from God. As Jeremiah 23.31 says "Behold, I (God) am against the (false) prophets who use

their tongues and say, 'God says'"; with Jeremiah saying to 'Hananiah the false prophet', "Here now, Hananiah, the Lord has not sent you, but you make this people trust in a lie" (Jeremiah 28.15). And so in reality, the message of these false prophets was just a rehashed version of what they had received from A) peers, B) forefathers (i.e., false prophets before them), or C) their own misguided inner voice (i.e., Satan); noting here that Satan will make you believe that 'his voice' is actually 'your own inner voice' to cause confusion in your own mind. In other words, for the want of their own glory noting that John 7.18 says 'He who speaks from himself seeks his own glory' - these false prophets continuously proclaimed a message that was 'of man', not God. And out of pride and vanity they arrogantly spoke on God's behalf, swearing by heaven and the throne of God, and breaking the 2nd Commandment, essentially creating 'a new, false persona for God' that people then thought was 'the real persona of God'. Thus, if nothing else, the Bible serves as documentation of 'multitudes of false prophets deceiving multitudes of people', and causing them - by of course speaking reverent lies and blasphemy from behind the name of God - to 'trust in lies'; making it clear why Jeremiah 17.5 says "Cursed is the man who trusts in man". Additionally, this also makes it clear, from a historical viewpoint, that it is highly likely that the same number of false prophets, if not more (see Matthew 24.5&11), are 'alive today as were alive in biblical accounts', therefore meaning that we, 'the majority of people', have done just as our forefathers, being blindly led astray into error and corruption by 'the majority voice of well respected, supposedly God-fearing and holy, reverently blasphemous, false prophets'. But we must remember that, their being in the majority, just as the Jewish hierarchy of Jesus' day, does not make them right, rather it simply makes them a bully voice who bullies people (with the name of God of course) into 'thinking that they are right'.

After realizing how our religious leaders have blindly overlooked and misinterpreted the 2nd Commandment (i.e., 'the <u>3rd part</u> of God's Primary Commandment'), 'vainly, yet reverently, speaking the hallowed and unspeakable name of God', it starts to become apparent that this 2nd Commandment is actually more important to understand than the 1st Commandment. Think about it. If false prophets never 'spoke vainly in the name of God' - momentarily considering that this would include 'speaking vainly in the name of any false god' - then there would be no such **thing** as <u>a false idol</u>, <u>a false god</u>, or <u>a false persona of God</u>. In other words, false idols and false gods do not 'spontaneously materialize out of thin air', but only 'come into existence' through the words or speech of a false prophet. And if people had never spoken words 'for God or for any other god', then humanity would have **never known** of the existence of *false idols, false gods*, and *false personas of God*. So in this respect, we can see that 'it is the breaking of the 2^{nd} Commandment that leads to the breaking of the 1st Commandment', making the upholding of the 2nd Commandment somewhat of most importance, with false prophets who break the 2nd Commandment to create false idols and false gods being 'the cause of offenses', and ultimately 'the cause of division, war, and hate' (Matthew 18.7). Hence, in order to truly identify 'who the wolf in sheep's clothing really is', we must be willing to admit that it is our trusted religious leaders, clothed as 'friends and peacemakers', that are boldly, arrogantly,

and blindly breaking the <u>2nd</u>, and <u>most important Commandment</u>, thereby acting as agents of Satan (i.e. *the Enemy* and *the Wolf*) who are unknowingly leading humanity into a ditch (i.e., *hell*).

Having recognized that the *poisonous fruit* (i.e., *false knowledge*) produced (i.e., *spoken*) by our religious leaders is 'what is responsible for the creation of false idols and false gods' - of course remembering that, by doing so, our religious leaders become 'the ones who dictate, for their own glory, what the idols and gods Say and want' - it is necessary to, in understandable words, define 'a false idol and a false god', and differentiate between the two. Note here that, anytime the word 'idol' or 'god' is used, it is implied to be a false idol, a false god, or false persona of God, as there is no such thing as 'a real idol', and any god, other than 'capital G' 'God', is a false god, or just 'Satan in disquise'. And so first off, it helps to understand that, a god (implied false god or false persona of the one true God) is something <u>non-physical</u> and <u>non-tangible</u>, whereas an <u>idOl</u> is a <u>physical, tangible</u> object. A god is 'a set of thoughts and ideas', 'a mindset', or 'a set of beliefs'; all of which are implied to be *mindsets* or *beliefs* consisting of <u>false knowledge</u>. A <u>god</u> can be thought of as '<u>intellectual</u> property' of which the religious leaders 'own the rights to', as they are responsible for creating the (false) ideas and beliefs that are associated with a particular god; which ultimately equates to 'the worship of man'. Note here that a god can also easily encompass 'a belief system' such as 'Nazism' that <u>does not go by</u> (or is <u>associated with</u>) the <u>name</u> of '<u>God</u> or <u>any other god</u>', yet is Still a (<u>false</u>) god nonetheless, with Hitler dictating 'what that god said' (i.e., Hitler's warped doctrine of genocide), ultimately making people bow to and worship man (i.e., Hitler); realizing here that you can essentially say 'Nazism' (or for that matter, any political party, such as <u>Democrat</u> or <u>Republican</u>, that people <u>swear</u> <u>oaths</u> of allegiance to, thereby being <u>obligated</u> to **stand by** them, placing <u>fig leaves</u> over any false **knowledge** that they produce) was a *false god* made *in the image* of *Hitler*', just as 'a *religion* is a *false* god made in a religious leader's image'. And so a god is 'a set of intellectual thoughts and ideas', while an **idol** (implied false idol) is 'a **physical object** (such as a **swastika**) used to **trigger** those intellectual thoughts and ideas'; realizing that the swastika was ironically 'a symbol of well being'. Note that an idol may be treated as the god itself, or may be used only to represent the god; either way it still serves as a tangible, physical object that is used to **trigger** 'the set of ideas and beliefs that are **associated** with a particular god'. 'The ideas and beliefs associated with a god' can be considered its personality or <u>persona</u> - i.e., its <u>likes</u> and <u>dislikes</u> - so that the 'persona of a god' is in itself 'the god'. I.e., since a god is a perceived spirit without any physical form and thus non-tangible, the idea of 'who or what a god is <u>in our mind</u>' (or its persona) is 'the god'. And so, an idol can be thought of as a control symbol which makes people submit to the **persona** which men have created for a god. An idol can be a drawing, carving, picture, sign, symbol, a **temple** itself, a **Bible** itself (as a physical book), or **any image** that triggers a desired mindset or set of beliefs (i.e., belief system). That is, an idol triggers in a person's mind 'the likes and dislikes' associated with the persona of a god; realizing here that this 'persona of a false god' essentially acts as a false conscience that is in constant battle with our true conscience (i.e., God). And although idols are traditionally thought of as being 'dead or inanimate', a human being, such as a

false prophet, can even be thought of as an idol. I.e., when a person 'sees' a false prophet, the beliefs associated with his false god are triggered in their mind. Thus, an idol is any physical, tangible representation of the beliefs and intellectual thoughts associated with 'the idol's corresponding non-physical, non-tangible god'. Here it must be reiterated that 'temples themselves' act as false idols, as Satan knows that people are most vulnerable to the cunning lies of his false prophets when they feel the false sense of security usually experienced in 'God's supposed temple'. But we must remember that "The Most High does not dwell in temples made with human hands", (Acts 7.48); which is why Jeremiah (7.4) warns us to "Not trust in these lying words, 'The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord". And as Jeremiah 23.11 says, "For both (false) prophet and priest are profane. Yes, in My (God's) house (i.e., temple) I have found their wickedness." So we should realize that, at the very least, most false prophets speak their lies from 'the power position of a temple', therefore making each and every temple 'a false idol representing a false belief system (i.e., false god) that does not describe God's true persona'.

In the Old Testament, Satan had to trick people into either A) totally fabricating a false god (like Baal, Mot, Chemosh, Milcom, and Asherah) with its own name, persona, words, and representative idol, or B) using 'the <u>name</u> of the one true God', then twisting or adding to His <u>existing</u> persona and words so that 'the persona of God' is Changed, and people begin to unknowingly worship a false god that goes by 'the name of the one true (capital G) God'. Note here that Satan, being a living demon just as God is the **Living God**, has <u>evolved</u> and does **not** really use 'method A' in today's world. 'Method B', 'redefining <u>God's persona</u>', is Satan's preferred method of deception, as it is much more COnfuSing if we are all using the same name (i.e., 'capital G' 'God') as the name of 'each of our respective gods'. And one of the most effective ways to redefine God's persona or identity is to 'create a dead idol' that is supposed to represent the Living God. Hence, an idol is used to speak lies in the name of God, whether knowingly or unknowingly, in order to **redefine** 'who God is'. Here we must realize that 'it is not so much the idol or image itself that is a defilement to God', but rather 'the lies that accompany the idol or image'. These lies are what defile or defame God's character or persona. So we must understand that, if we don't know that 'lies are even being told from behind an idol', then the idol appears to be **deceptively harmless** in the eyes of most people. That is, people can't fathom the <u>lies</u> that a false idol represents because they truly believe that 'those lies are truth'. As an example of 'speaking lies from behind an idol', think of how we all understand the idea of 'catfishing' in today's 'online world'. An imposter puts 'a desirable picture of a model' (with this paralleling an idol, such as an image of Jesus) on the **internet** in order to lure or 'fish for' unsuspecting prey. In this respect, a **predator** is able to 'type (i.e., speak) <u>lies from behind</u> a <u>model's picture</u> (i.e., false <u>idol</u>), thereby making up a <u>false online persona</u> (i.e., false god)'; which in turn makes it much easier to take advantage of someone, usually for money or sex. As another example, think of the **American flag** as an **idol**; noting that this would **parallel** 'an image of an inanimate object' - such as a CrOSS or 'sacred stone' (see Acts 19.35) - as opposed to 'an image or picture of an animated (or living) person'. While an American flag is a symbol of 'liberty,

equality, truth, and justice', think how many people and politicians have stood behind the American flag and spoke lies, and we eagerly believed them, all because their lies were associated with 'a symbol of truth'. By associating themselves with 'the American Way', people and politicians are able to advance 'their own selfish agenda', disguising it as 'the agenda of the common good'; as if they received 'divine' inspiration from the 'American spirit', when it was their own selfish inspiration. So in like fashion, false prophets, from behind 'dead, lifeless idols' - i.e., images of Christ, crosses, and sacred stones - will teach and advance 'their own agendas' (i.e., lies) that are disguised as being 'the agenda of God' (i.e., the truth), saying 'they too received divine inspiration from the Spirit of God', while it was their own selfish inspiration. Thus, if false prophets (or anyone) can 'speak their own thoughts from behind an image of God, or something associated with God or Jesus', they can more easily redefine God into 'someone that coincidentally supports all of their selfish man-made agendas', saying 'This is not my law, it is God's Law', thereby quite simply taking away the burden of having to justify themselves in regard to their man-made law. I.e., it is a lot easier to control, enslave, manipulate, and take advantage of people (and even have them keep a good, positive attitude about these offenses) by saying and teaching - from behind an image of God - 'You're giving money to God, not me', 'You're working for God, not me', 'It's God's will, not mine', or 'You're fighting for God, not me'. As Habakkuk 2.19 says regarding false prophets who 'speak lies from behind breathless false idols', teaching people 'what the idol's corresponding god says and wants' - "Woe to him (i.e., a false prophet) who says to wood (i.e., a cross), 'Awake!' To <u>silent</u> stone (i.e., a temple), 'Arise! It shall teach!"

Additionally, it should be noted that, it is **not** imperative to have an **idol** in order to have a **god**, but it certainly helps with 'the control factor'. Imagine not having Santa Claus or a Christmas tree to instantly trigger your brain to think of presents, parties, families, and holidays. Here we can draw a parallel that images of Santa Claus and Christmas trees are like control symbols or images that trigger certain *preprogrammed* ideas, mindsets, and beliefs. Hence, we will be more likely to agree with and buy 'something promoted with Santa Claus and Christmas trees', as they have been given a positive connotation in our minds, triggering good times. So, just as images of Santa Claus, Christmas trees, Easter bunnies, etc., can be used as 'control images that are manipulated for monetary gain', false prophets can also use an idol or image that has a positive, favorable name (i.e., an idol named Jesus, Mary, the seat of Peter, etc.) attached to it as 'a control image' in order to manipulate 'what beliefs are attached to the image's corresponding god', thereby gaining unrighteous power and authority. Hence, to be the person (i.e., false prophet) who controls an image or idol - such as a priest or 'the king over priests' (assuming no 'separation of church and state', as was the case in the majority of history) - is to also be the same person who controls 'what ideas, mindsets, and beliefs are associated with the idol's corresponding god'; noting that this is where false prophets begin attaching lies to images of God, Jesus, Mary, etc., in order to redefine God's persona for their own supremacy. And so regardless of whether or **not** a priest, preacher, imam, rabbi, etc. (i.e., false prophet) uses an **idol** 'to teach', thereby **more** easily controlling his slaves, a false prophet who represents a god still controls 'the persona of that god', and thus controls the minds and consciences of the people; which of course ensures their allegiance to him, thereby ensuring the false prophet's power and authority. In this way, it can be said

that a *priest*, or 'any king or religious leader who <u>represents</u> a god', is <u>himself acting as an idol</u>, <u>triggering</u> and <u>simultaneously manipulating</u> 'the <u>set of beliefs</u> that are associated with his god (or false persona of the one true God)'.

So, priests, kings, and religious leaders will <u>use</u> and <u>manipulate</u> 'the name and persona of a god (or God)' saying 'This is what our god (or God) wants', thereby being 'the means' by which they advance 'their own agenda', which is of course disguised as being 'a god's (or God's) agenda'. In this respect, we, <u>instinctively knowing</u> that 'these men are <u>not God</u>', are **allowing** them to basically 'steal God's identity and impersonate God', ultimately changing God's persona, and doing so boldly, right front of our faces, without even having to 'dress up' as God; although Catholic priests do say with their double tongue (in regard to 'the supposed forgiveness of sins') 'We are Christ, but we are not Christ'. Hence, we must know that, if men can impersonate God and/or Christ, then they can 'enact their own rules and laws' which are disguised as 'God's rules and laws'. As a parallel, imagine if someone was able to impersonate the President and forge his signature. They could 'enact their own laws' under the disguise of 'the name of the President', making us think that their 'fake laws' are actually 'the President's real laws'; realizing that this in turn manipulates the 'perceived persona' of the President (who is paralleled with God in this example). So with these things in mind, we can now examine the Samaritans in 1 Kings chapter 12. The idolatry of King Jeroboam and his priests in Samaria started by using the name of the one true God 'who brought them out of the land of Egypt' (see 1 Kings 12.28). The idol or control symbol that physically represented God was a golden calf. And, although they used 'the name of the one true God', they made up new, defiled beliefs that were not from God (i.e., they were 'fake rules or laws'), and made the people submit to those new, man-made beliefs using their idol, the golden calf; which was of course backed by the fear associated with 'the name of the one true God'. In other words, the Samaritan King and his priests 'took the name of God in vain' (i.e., broke the 2nd **Commandment**, not to mention blatantly breaking the **1**st **Commandment**), thereby making people (through the **fear** associated with God's name) **submit** to their man-made laws under the **false pretense** of being God's laws. So the king's fake rules and laws represented a 'manipulated, false persona of the one true God' which became their 'false god'; and hence the people were 'following and worshipping a false god' while thinking that they were 'following and worshipping the one true God'. Thus, it is extremely important to recognize here that 'the Samaritans were using the name of the one true God', but by following man-made beliefs and fake laws, they were actually 'following a false god that Went by the name of their religion'. Therefore, 'the religion of Samaritanism' = 'a false god' quite simply because 'the religion of Samaritanism' (using this term for ease of reference) = 'a set of false man-made beliefs, rules, and laws' that were **not** from God. In general equation format, this means that:

a religion = a set or system of false man-made beliefs that describe a false persona of God = a false god

or

'<u>a religion</u>' = '<u>a false god</u>'

Furthermore, a <u>small group</u> of *fanatical* people using God's name to do evil is called a <u>cult</u>, usually having a <u>negative</u> connotation. And, once that <u>small group</u> grows into a large group of fanatical people

using God's name to do evil, it becomes **normalized**, and we lose sight of the fact that 'they are <u>actually just a big cult</u> that has been <u>renamed</u> as a <u>religion</u>'; of course giving them a <u>positive</u> connotation. But, both small cults and big cults (i.e. religions) have assigned 'a set of false man-made beliefs' to 'the <u>name</u> of the one true God', and so are actually following a false god that they themselves have **fabricated** with their own minds. So in reality, we have simply **fooled** ourselves, renaming all of our different false gods, not with names (such as Baal, Asherah, etc.) that are openly and outwardly different than the name 'God', but with 'the names of cults and religions' (such as Catholicism, Islam, Judaism, Protestantism, 'Non-denominationalism', etc.) who of course each individually say that 'they follow a set of beliefs that most accurately describes God's true persona'. But the fact is that no religion describes God's true persona, as <u>all</u> religions ultimately cause <u>division</u>, which is the **antithesis** of 'a unified God'. As Zechariah 14.9 says - concerning Christ's return and the subsequent destruction of <u>religion</u> - "The Lord is <u>one</u>, and His name <u>one</u>". So it is of absolute importance to understand that <u>our</u> religions are our false gods that we follow and worship before the one true God. As Micah 4.5 says, 'For <u>all people</u> walk each in the name of his own <u>false god</u>'. Hence, Satan steals the name and identity of the one true God, impersonating God's (or Jesus') voice, in order to assign to God's <u>name</u> 'different sets of false, man-made beliefs' so that we actually follow one of Satan many false gods (i.e., cults or religions), while being under the impression that 'we are following the one true God'. And so we must come to realize that our <u>religions</u> are nothing more than 'oversized cults that act as *false gods'*, and we have blindly placed these *cults* and *religions* <u>before</u> the one true God, thereby blindly and blatantly breaking the 1st Commandment.

Now you may say to yourself 'How can Satan deceive us to the point that the entire world would openly create false gods, serve those false gods before the one true God, and even do so with God's 1st Commandment right out in plain sight?' Well, while most people will find is impossible, surely those same people would agree that 'Satan is the most deceptive being ever'. So they must recognize that it is their <u>pride</u> and <u>ego</u> that will not allow them to believe that they have been <u>taken</u>; especially the egos of many adult males who pride themselves on 'making deals, scheming, and negotiating', always thinking that they have *inside information* or *proprietary knowledge* with which they can take advantage of unknowing or uneducated people. Note here that this is Why Jesus spoke in parables: to keep the real knowledge from arrogant men who 'use knowledge to take advantage of others'. Hence, for people, especially the **proud** and the **arrogant**, to agree that 'Satan is the most deceptive being ever', yet **simultaneously** insist that 'it is **not possible** for Satan to deceive the world to this magnitude', is <u>double minded</u>. I.e., it is like saying in simplest terms 'Satan <u>can</u> deceive me, but Satan <u>can't</u> deceive me'; which is the double minded nonsense that Satan teaches all of his blind, arrogant, and proud ministers to boldly say. So while we may think that Satan can't deceive us to this magnitude remembering that 'the <u>best deceptions</u> are the ones where we <u>do not even know</u> we have been deceived' - Satan has deceived the Whole world (see Revelation 12.9), and has made us blindly create false gods which we blindly serve, to varying degrees, before God. That is, we don't completely serve our false gods, but are torn and divided inside between 'serving our false gods (i.e., our religions)' and

'serving God'; making us just like those in the Old Testament who "Feared the Lord, yet served their own gods" (2 Kings 17.33). Consider the following points that help explain and recognize Satan's deceptive practices and 'how multitudes of people can become completely blind to being able to recognize the true Christ and the true God'.

- 1. Satan is, and has been, in business to lie; do not underestimate 'how good he is at doing his job'. Satan, just like any business, has set up a 'doing business as' account in our minds and in society. It reads on the account 'Satan dba Jesus'; or 'Satan doing business as Jesus'. And Satan has become an expert at impersonating Jesus so that we let our guard down, thereby becoming more susceptible to believing his lies. As an example, put yourself in a spy movie or novel where the enemy has placed an agent deep undercover, with the enemy being paralleled to Satan. You have unknowingly 'taken this enemy into your confidence' and you trust him. And he, just as Satan, has portrayed himself as 'being on your side', when he's actually gathering intelligence and plotting against you and your people in order to ultimately defeat or destroy you. So we must think that, if we as humans can make movies and write books about such premeditated deception, do you not think that Satan has devised these same 'plots of deception' long before we ever arrived on this earth? Therefore, the last thing Satan will do, acting just as the undercover enemy agent, is to 'blow his own cover in your mind'; of course realizing that Satan will hold out about his true identity until Jesus returns to reclaim His true identity, thereby exposing Satan as 'an undercover enemy agent in our minds'.
- 2. Satan, or Lucifer, which means 'bringer of light', can 'transform himself into an angel of light' (2 Corinthians 11.14), meaning that Satan is capable of producing a false light that we think is the real light of Jesus. And keeping in mind that a 'star' is synonymous with 'producing light', Isaiah 14.12 (describing Lucifer or Satan) says "How you are fallen from heaven, Morning Star, son of the dawn". But how can <u>Satan</u> be 'the Morning Star' when Jesus says that <u>He</u> is 'the Morning Star' in Revelation 22.16? While this might seem to not make sense to someone who does not understand the nature of Lucifer, Isaiah 14.12 is revealing to us that 'Satan, the false Morning Star, will assume the name and identity of the true Morning Star (i.e., Jesus)', thereby fooling us by his false light. Consider here that plants can grow in artificial, false sunlight, and that they can't tell the difference between 'fake sun' and 'real sun'. Unfortunately, Satan's deceptive nature, and his ability to 'appear as and sound like Jesus, the Sun of Righteousness' (Malachi 4.2), makes it <u>almost impossible</u> for us to tell the **difference** between 'the fake son (Satan)' and 'the real Son (Jesus)'. So what people (i.e., God's plantings) must realize is that, if we can't fully **identify** 'who Satan is' and that his light is **false**, then we will never be able to fully identify 'who Jesus (or God) is' and 'what His true light looks and feels like'. Thus, the proud assumption (mainly by our religious leaders) that 'it is impossible to be deceived by Satan, the bringer of false light and fake sun', is what has made 'God's pleasant plants' grow into 'degenerative weeds'. I.e., we have, for thousands of years, grown under Satan's false light and fake sun, thereby wrongly believing that his false gods are *righteous* and *good*. But when the

Sun of Righteousness or Morning Star rises (see 2 Peter 1.19) to shine on a world in total darkness, 'the Dawn' (i.e., the return of Christ, or 'day of the Lord') will bring about 'a new age of peace and light', as the 'degenerative weeds' are consumed and burned by the light or brightness of Christ (i.e., His knowledge), thereby allowing 'God's pleasant plants' to once again thrive.

- 3. John 1.10-11 says that 'Although the world was made through Jesus, <u>His own world</u> (or people) did **not** recognize or accept Him'. Remembering that 'Satan operates his business under the name of Jesus', and that 'Satan disguises his false light as the true light of Christ', we must ask ourselves the following question. If the majority of people 2000 years ago:
 - <u>A)</u> could <u>not recognize</u> the Son of God, <u>even when He stood right in front of them</u>,
 - B) thought that Jesus was crazy, or 'out of His mind' (Mark 3.21),
 - <u>C)</u> thought that Jesus was a <u>sinner</u> (John 9.24), had an <u>unclean demon</u> in Him (John 8.48 and Mark 3.30), and 'worked for Satan' (Matthew 12.24), and
 - **D)** crucified Jesus thinking that they were serving God (John 16.2),

having met or seen Him in the flesh? The answer is obviously 'no'. Yet unfortunately, many religious leaders that are completely blind, with hardened hearts of stone, will still boldly insist that 'they know who Jesus is', and that 'they could not possibly be taken and deceived to this magnitude'. And so we must understand that 'Satan's lies know no boundaries', transcending our human languages - meaning our hearts can understand things that our minds cannot yet understand - with 'lies that confusingly sound (to our minds) like truth'; of course making Satan 'the father of lies' (John 8.44). Think about it. Satan has 6000+ years of 'Iying experience', so to say that 'you can spot Satan's cunning lies' is naïve at best. Therefore, just as Satan, 2000 years ago, redefined 'who the Messiah Should be' so that the majority of people did not recognize or accept Jesus as 'truly being the Messiah' (i.e., they thought Jesus was a false messiah), Satan has systematically placed his lies right next to the words of Christ in order to redefine Christ's true persona so that, when Christ does return, we blindly repeat history by not recognizing or accepting Him, and thinking 'This could not possibly be the true Messiah; He must be a false messiah'.

4. One of Satan's most effective 'forms of deception' is to actually 'quote Scripture and then purposefully misinterpret the verse'. In other words, Satan quotes a verse from the Bible (i.e., the word of God) then changes the original intention of the verse, thereby tricking people into 'blindly doing the will of Satan', while thinking that they are 'doing the will of God'. Or, by 'changing the original intention of Scripture', Satan tricks people into 'disobeying and opposing God', while truly believing that they are 'obeying and supporting God'; just as Satan did to Adam and Eve. And so we must realize that, if you change intention, you change

everything, and you may as well have written different words altogether. But by quoting Scripture and then changing its intention, it still sounds very much like it is 'the word of God', when in reality it has become 'the well disquised word of Satan'. So Satan deceives us by 'twisting the word of God' - such as giving the literal meaning to figurative words - not by 'making up a <u>new</u> word', as 'a new, totally different word' is more of an <u>obvious lie</u>. I.e., Satan plays on the actual 'written words and actions of Christ' in order to more easily deceive us; he does **not** 'make up **totally new words** or **actions** for Christ that are not in the Bible'. Hence, by playing on Christ's words of truth, Satan keeps his *lies* close to the truth so that it is hard to tell the difference; just as it is hard to tell the difference between 'the wheat and the tares' before sprouting. I.e., by 'changing the intention of Christ's words', Satan tells lies that are so close to the truth that that you think they are the truth, making 'the best lies those closest to the truth'. Think about it. By keeping his lies close to the truth, Satan makes his evil, hidden agenda appear 'on the surface' to be harmless. Yet when compounded over generations, these 'seemingly harmless, ever so slight, twists on Christ's words' turn into unfathomable consequences for humanity, as they are sadistically designed by Satan to 'look like seeds of righteousness and peace', while they are really 'well disquised seeds of corruption and war'. Furthermore, we should consider the fact that, just as 'God is a Living God', 'Satan is a *living demon'*, meaning that <u>Satan</u>, having an advantage over us, was there when events in the past actually took place, thereby being able to ever so slightly change 'the truth of what actually happened', again allowing Satan to 'keep his lies close to the truth', or close to actual events in the past. Note here also that 'Satan being a living demon' allows him to continually **change doctrine** to fit, or **Stay normalized** in each **new generation** of people. And so by changing the intention of, and misinterpreting Scripture, Satan is ultimately able to change (i.e., rewrite) the personas of Jesus, God, Peter, Mary, the Prophets, etc., which ultimately allows Satan to 'change God's laws into man-made laws', while making us think that we are still following God's laws; i.e., 'disobeying God while thinking that we are obeying God'.

'The <u>temptation</u> of <u>Christ</u> in the desert' employs some key methods of deception used by Satan, showing of course 'his cunning nature' and that 'he knows <u>no boundaries</u> when it comes to lying'. Those <u>methods</u> are: <u>A)</u> Satan <u>disguises himself</u> 'as <u>God' to</u> Jesus, impersonating God's voice in Jesus' mind, and <u>B)</u>
Satan <u>quotes Scripture</u> and then <u>changes its intention</u> by giving <u>literal meaning</u> to <u>figurative language</u>. Note here that many people can't fathom that '<u>it is even possible</u> for Satan to be able to impersonate God in Jesus' mind', yet you must consider that, <u>if</u> Jesus could <u>clearly see</u> that it was Satan (<u>not</u> God) telling Him these things, then <u>it Would not have been a test for Jesus</u>. So just as an <u>impersonator</u> 'makes his voice <u>sound like</u> someone else', Jesus, <u>not seeing an actual person</u>, thought <u>Satan's voice was</u> or <u>could be</u> God's voice</u>. Realize here that, just as the <u>cunning serpent</u> did <u>not</u> identify himself <u>as</u> '<u>a</u> cunning serpent' to Eve, but rather <u>as</u> 'a voice of righteousness', Satan does not identify himself <u>as</u> 'Satan', but rather <u>as</u> 'Jesus' Father'. Now it may <u>Seem obvious</u> to us, and consequently Jesus, that

'it is <u>Satan</u> who is talking', but we must remember that 'we are <u>outside</u> this story <u>looking in'</u>. So you will notice that it was Jesus who <u>insisted</u> that 'this voice was Satan, and <u>not</u> His Father', yet <u>Satan Never</u> admitted that 'he was Satan', never 'blowing his cover' so to speak. So the <u>untold premise</u> that is <u>key</u> to understanding 'the temptation in the desert' is that Jesus could <u>only hear</u> a voice in His mind, and <u>was **not** able to <u>physically see</u> that '<u>it was really Satan</u> who was speaking', with Satan, impersonating God and speaking the word of God, trying to make Jesus <u>truly believe</u> that 'he was God'.</u>

Hence, in Matthew 4.6, Satan leads Jesus up to the pinnacle of the temple, and then (disguised of course as God's voice) tries to trick Jesus into jumping off and killing Himself, 'quoting Scripture, and then changing its intention'; or changing figurative language into literal language, which is a recurring theme in 'Satan's playbook'. So in Matthew 4.6, Satan quotes Psalm 91.11-12, saying, "God shall give His angels charge over you, and in their hands they shall bear you up, lest you dash your foot against a stone"; essentially claiming that 'Jesus can jump and will be lifted up with the wings of God's angels, thereby never hitting the ground'. In order to truly recognize Satan's deception, we must look at the setup or context of Psalm 91.11-12, which is found in Psalm 91.4. Verse 4 says "God shall cover you with **feathers**, and under <u>His wings</u> you shall take refuge." This language is obviously **figurative** in nature, giving 'God and the person being covered with feathers' bird-like qualities, such as 'the ability to fly'. But knowing that this language is figurative, Satan of course changes the original intention of this passage to imply that these verses have literal meaning, saying that, if Jesus were to jump from the highest point in town, then He would - because He had been 'covered in God's feathers' - in fact fly with God's angels (i.e., 'under His wings'), and therefore 'Jesus' would not dash His foot against a stone'. And so, in an attempt to alter the **destiny** of Jesus (i.e., 'change everything'), Satan impersonated God to Jesus by 'quoting the word of God' and then 'changing its intention'. I.e., Satan changed the original intention of Scripture (i.e., God's word) to try and trick Jesus into killing Himself. Additionally, we must appreciate the <u>irony</u> of this situation in that, <u>even Jesus</u>, 'the Word of God' Himself was tested with 'the word of God by Satan'; realizing hear that, consequently, we should also expect that leaders in the highest positions of religion will be tested by 'Satan using the word of God'. Thus, by A) 'impersonating God', and B) 'changing the intentions of the word of God' (many times by purposely misinterpreting a figurative passage as literal, or vice versa), Satan is able to make us do his will, all while under the preconception that 'we are doing God's will'; i.e., Satan deceives by making us (just as Adam and Eve) blindly disobey God while thinking that we are obeying God. And so again, if you change intention, you change everything, ultimately realizing that, by changing the intentions of the word of God, Satan has changed 'the true persona of God' into a false persona, making us blindly worship one of Satan's many false gods that go by the name 'capital G' 'God'.

As mentioned earlier 'a set of false man-made beliefs (based of course on **changed intentions**) that describes a <u>false persona</u> of <u>God</u>' is said to be '<u>a false god</u>'. And as our <u>religions all</u> represent '<u>belief systems</u> that (to <u>varying</u> degrees) do <u>not</u> describe God's true persona', then **our religions** = **false gods**; of course realizing that Satan's methods of deception (i.e., 'impersonating God and Jesus' and 'purposely

misinterpreting Their words') lead people to <u>wrongly</u> believe that 'their religions are <u>gateways</u> to God', while they are really 'false gods that <u>impede a connection</u> with God'. And so we must realize that this was the situation 2000 years ago. That is, 'the religion of <u>Judaism'</u> had become 'a set of false man-made beliefs, laws, traditions, mindsets, rituals, ceremonies, etc., that <u>did not describe God</u>, but rather <u>Satan'</u>. Therefore, 'the religion of <u>Judaism'</u> had become '<u>a false god</u> before the one true God', impeding a connection with God, and <u>consequently **salvation**</u>, while claiming the <u>complete opposite</u>, saying 'There is no salvation outside of <u>Judaism'</u> (see Acts 15.1); i.e., 'There is no salvation without the <u>men</u> of the <u>Jewish hierarchy</u>'. Recalling that the religious leaders in Jesus' time (as well as now, in our present time) spoke 'reverent blasphemy' that <u>sounded like</u> 'praise and honor to God' while actually being 'abominable filth that <u>defiled</u> God's true persona', Jesus says to the Pharisees and Teachers of the Law (or Scribes) in Mark 7.6-13:

You <u>honor God with your words</u>, but your <u>heart</u> is really <u>far away</u>. So it is no use for you to worship God, as you teach (as being <u>sacred tradition</u>) your own <u>man-made laws</u>, <u>disquising</u> them as <u>God's laws</u>. I.e., by teaching people to <u>fear man-made laws</u>, they are really <u>worshiping man</u>, not God, and <u>fearing man</u>, not God. Thus, in a <u>clever way</u> (i.e., <u>disquised</u> with words that honor God, speaking <u>reverent blasphemy</u>), your <u>man-made laws</u> and traditions actually <u>reject</u> and lay aside <u>God's laws</u>. That is, <u>you make the word and the laws of God of no</u> <u>effect through your so-called sacred and holy tradition</u> which you have received from your forefathers.'

So what we must understand here is that, through hundreds and hundreds of years of 'supposedly sacred Jewish traditions and truth' (which were really just inherited lies or ancestral sin, see Section 13), Satan (i.e., his false prophets) systematically rewrote 'God's law', replacing it with 'man's law' - by of course 'impersonating God' and 'changing the intentions of His word' - so that the Jews of Jesus' day were blindly following and worshiping Satan, while truly believing that they were following and worshiping **God**. I.e., Satan, by feeding them 'false knowledge that appeared to be pleasant fruit', tricked the Pharisees, Scribes, Chief Priests, elders, and (consequently) their followers, into believing that 'his lie was the truth of God' - or 'his laws were God's laws' - so that their man-made beliefs, laws, traditions, mindsets, rituals, ceremonies, etc. (i.e., Judaism itself) became a false god; which is what Jesus is alluding to in John 8.54-55 (being a very understated passage) when He says to the Jews 'You <u>claim</u> that God is your <u>god</u>, but you have <u>never known</u> the one **true** God'. And of course it must also be mentioned that, the <u>reason</u> the religious leaders were tricked into 'changing God's laws by blindly eating Satan's poisonous fruit of false knowledge' was their lust to have, just like Adam and Eve, supremacy and authority over the people; i.e., the coveting of God's supreme authority. Hence, the Pharisees and Scribes (or more specifically, their *forefathers*) created laws and traditions that made the people submit (no doubt using tactics of guilt and shame) to them, enslaving the people's minds and consciences to the religious leaders, while thinking it was God's will to do so; as the laws and traditions of the Pharisees and Scribes were 'spoken in the name of God' and 'sworn by heaven and the throne of God', thereby leading the people to believe that 'these men were truly chosen by God'. But in reality, it

was Satan who chose them, granting false authority in the name of God. So by fabricating the idea that 'to oppose the religious leaders' is 'to oppose God', the Pharisees and Scribes made people submit to them by the *fear* and *terror* associated with the name of God. I.e., as many people are *scared* and fearful of opposing God, thereby receiving eternal damnation, the Pharisees and Scribes played on this fear, identifying themselves as agents of God (just as the serpent did to Eve) so that people would also be scared and fearful of them, thereby ensuring their control and power over the people, and guaranteeing the people's blind allegiance for generations to come. In essence the Pharisees and Scribes - by speaking lies in the name of God - were changing 'the true persona of God' to be more like themselves so that they could 'play God' or 'have the authority of God'. That is, if you can convince people that 'God is like you', and vice versa, then out of 'fear of God' they will adhere to 'what YOU say' as if 'God said it'. This fear and terror produced by 'man-made laws disguised as God's laws' can be seen in the parents of 'the blind man who received sight from Jesus' (see John chapter 9). The parents, when asked by the Pharisees about their son's sight, would not answer, as anyone perceived to be confessing that 'Jesus was the Christ', would be expelled from the synagogue. And since the Pharisees had identified themselves as being 'one in the same with God', expulsion (or excommunication) from the synagogue (see verse 22) by the Pharisees, or any of the Jewish religious leaders, also meant expulsion from God's salvation. I.e., excommunication from Judaism meant eternal damnation, as they believed in 'no salvation outside Judaism', realizing that Catholicism, Islam, etc., still believes in 'no salvation outside of their religion (or false god)'. So we must recognize that, the parents (just like many religiously devout people today) did *not* oppose the Pharisees, or <u>even attempt</u> to defend their <u>own</u> <u>son</u>, because they had been <u>held captive</u> their <u>entire lives</u> by the <u>fear</u> and <u>intimidation</u> inflicted by 'the religious leaders and their man-made laws'; which 'the parents' had been taught were 'God's leaders and God's laws'. In other words, by 'speaking falsely on behalf of God' (i.e., 'swearing falsely by heaven'), thereby 'threatening and intimidating people (whether spoken or unspoken) with the unrighteous fear and terror of eternal damnation from God', the Pharisees and other religious leaders were able to make people submit to 'them and their man-made laws' as if they were submitting to 'God and His laws'. As Isaiah 29.13 says, 'The people's fear of God is taught by the laws of man'.

Hence we must recognize that, 'to <u>institute man-made laws and rules</u> using the <u>name</u> of God' is <u>idolatry</u>, as violating the 2nd Commandment - i.e., 'speaking falsely on God's behalf' - to institute those laws, makes 'you and your laws' 'a <u>false idol</u> and <u>a false god'</u> (respectively); which of course <u>also</u> violates the 1st Commandment. And by making yourself a <u>false idol</u> - or '<u>false representative</u> of God's true persona' - it becomes quite easy to <u>justify and enforce</u> those laws that are attributed to 'your false god' (i.e., 'your set of false man-made beliefs' or 'your religion'). Therefore we should understand that the <u>idolatry</u> of 'instituting man-made laws and rules that are <u>disguised as</u> God's laws and rules' is a sin that is <u>perpetuated</u> by the religious leaders in order to <u>maintain</u> control and power over the multitudes of people. I.e., <u>idolatry = control</u> and power over men. So by 'not keeping God's name hallowed and unspoken', thereby breaking the 2nd Commandment, and ultimately committing idolatry, religious leaders have been able to <u>enslave men</u> 'in the name of God' for thousands of years. By

speaking **reverent blasphemy**, 'honoring God with words while their hearts were far away', religious leaders have - for thousands of years - been able to institute 'man-made laws that are disquised as God's laws' in order to be 'supreme like God', and to have control and power over men. And this, 'the idolatry that the Pharisees and Scribes were quilty of', is what Jesus was conveying in Mark 7.6-23; realizing that 'the adulterous fornicators who proudly speak blasphemy and practice covetousness in Mark 7.21-22' is referring to 'the idolatrous religious leaders' who, acting as a figurative harlot, covet God's authority and speak reverent blasphemy, thereby 'figuratively (or spiritually) fornicating' with Satan and committing 'figurative adultery' against God (see Section 17). Thus, the religious leaders of Judaism were practicing idolatry, breaking the 2nd Commandment - while of course claiming to uphold the Commandments - thereby making 'themselves and their belief system (i.e., Judaism itself)' 'false *idols* and *a false god*'. Yet, we must realize that, most people today, if asked, cannot answer the simple question, 'What were the Pharisees and Scribes doing that was so wrong?' So you must consider that, if you cannot answer this simple question, then you really have no grasp on true idolatry and 'what Jesus was even talking about' when He spoke to the religious leaders; which of course also means that you must reconsider everything that you have been taught by any religious leader, as the religious leaders who have been teaching us since childhood are **exactly like** the **Pharisees** and **Scribes**, boldly claiming to uphold the Commandments, while blindly breaking the Commandments (in particular, the 2nd Commandment).

The Pharisees and Scribes (and of course their forefathers) broke the 2nd Commandment and spoke falsely on behalf of God, thereby setting up the supreme, exclusionary mindset or belief system of Judaism. I.e., the Jewish religious leaders were 'puffed up' with supremacy (which is essentially idolatry), thereby teaching the 'leavened, supreme doctrine' that 'there is no salvation outside Judaism and without the Jewish hierarchy' (see John 4.22 and Acts 15.1); meaning that people such as the Gentiles and Samaritans were excluded from salvation. And so most people are UNAWARE that 'this exclusion, supremacy, and ultimate equality for everyone' is the main idea of 'The Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard'. In Matthew 20.1-16, the laborers who arrived early in the morning represented the Jews, who believed that they had been adhering to God's laws for a long time - i.e., <u>'laboring</u> from the days of Moses and Abraham by performing <u>deeds of the law</u> such as circumcision and daily sacrifices' - and therefore should receive salvation first. The laborers who arrived late in the day represented the Gentiles, who were perceived by the Jews as not following God's laws (or Commandments) - i.e., they had 'not labored at all', as they did not perform 'Jewish deeds of the law' and therefore should receive salvation last, or not at all. But Jesus was telling the Jews that 'the Gentiles were in fact equal to them' - i.e., all the laborers were paid the same wage - because the Jewish traditions, rituals, sacrifices, and other 'deeds of the Jewish law' meant nothing to God; i.e., 'all God wants is kindness and mercy, not sacrifice' (Matthew 12.7). Thus, because the Jews, with their supreme and exclusive mindset, had judged the Gentiles as being last in terms of salvation - based of course on Jewish man-made laws, traditions, and inherited lies (i.e., ancestral sin) - then it would be the Jews (showing up first, yet receiving pay last) who were to be judged (see Matthew 7.2) as last in

terms of salvation; which is what Jesus meant by 'The <u>last</u> (i.e., <u>Gentiles</u>) will be <u>first</u>, and the <u>first</u> (i.e., <u>Jews</u>) will be <u>last</u>' (Matthew 20.16). Note here that 'the Jews in this parable' represent <u>anyone</u> in today's world who performs <u>any</u> religious ritual, <u>thinking</u> that ritual is <u>necessary</u> for salvation. And so ultimately this parable is stating '<u>equality for all</u>' and that 'no one is <u>paid more</u> than the other, in terms of <u>salvation</u>, for performing religious deeds such as <u>sacraments</u>, or <u>any</u> and <u>all</u> other worship rituals and services'; which are <u>not</u> to be confused with 'good or bad <u>works</u>', as these are '<u>how</u> we are to be judged' (see Matthew 25.31-46). Additionally it must be realized that, if 'labor' is taken as 'literal labor or work', instead of 'the <u>laboring</u> of performing worthless <u>religious deeds</u> of the law', then the meaning of this parable becomes quite skewed, <u>wrongly portraying</u> God as being <u>Unfair</u>, not rewarding people for their hard labor, and even <u>unjustly treating</u> those who do labor hard. So again, 'laboring in this parable' is referring to 'those performing religious rituals', with those rituals causing supremacy and exclusion, thereby being the <u>reason</u> why 'those laboring hard - <u>yet in vain</u> - since early morning' were <u>justly</u> treated as <u>last</u>.

Furthermore, this <u>same theme</u> of 'supremacy, exclusion, and equality' in 'The Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard' is echoed in the <u>attitude</u> of the <u>older brother</u> in 'The Parable of the <u>Prodigal Son</u>'; which has been <u>greatly</u> misinterpreted. That is, most people <u>misinterpret</u> that 'the prodigal son was actually a <u>man</u> who went off to foreign lands to fornicate with <u>harlots</u>'. This is false. Remembering that Jesus spoke almost exclusively in figurative or symbolic language, the <u>prodigal son</u> in Luke 15.11-32 <u>figuratively represents</u> or <u>symbolizes</u> the <u>Samaritans</u> (i.e., those of the Northern Kingdom of Israel led by Jeroboam) who went off to the mountains of Shechem to start a 'counterfeit' religion that worshiped golden calves (see 1 Kings 12.25-33). Eventually, Jeroboam's successors also worshiped the false god <u>Baal</u>. 1 Kings 16.31-33 says that 'Ahab built an altar, an image, and a temple to worship Baal'. Therefore Elijah, a true Prophet of God, <u>declared a drought</u>, and consequently "<u>There was a severe famine in Samaria</u>" (1 Kings 18.2). The drought does finally <u>end</u> when Elijah proves the prophets of Baal to be false prophets, and with the people of Israel declaring that "The Lord, He is God" (1 Kings 18.39). And so now examine the following <u>irrefutable parallels</u> between 'the <u>Samaritans</u> and the <u>prodigal son</u>' which <u>undeniably</u> prove that the <u>prodigal son</u> symbolizes the <u>Samaritans</u>, and is in fact quite simply a parable that <u>paraphrases</u> 'one of the <u>biggest stories</u> of the Old Testament'.

<u>A. God divided</u> the Kingdom of Israel. Then the Samaritans, leaving God, took His inheritance (i.e., <u>10</u> of the <u>12 tribes</u> of Israel, as noted in 1 Kings 11.31) and went off to <u>another country</u>; i.e., Jeroboam built <u>Shechem</u> in the mountains of Ephraim, as noted in 1 Kings 12.25.

=

The <u>father divided</u> his livelihood. Then the prodigal son took his inheritance and journeyed to a <u>far</u> <u>country</u> (Luke 15.12-13).

B. The Samaritans wasted God's inheritance, <u>playing the **harlot**</u> by figuratively fornicating, or <u>joining</u> themselves with false gods (i.e., <u>Satan</u>, <u>Baal</u>, etc., as noted in 1 Kings 12.28 and 16.31-33); that is, they joined themselves to <u>Baal</u> in Samaria, a <u>foreign</u> land.

=

The prodigal son wasted his father's inheritance <u>in the company of **harlots**</u> (Luke 15.13, 15, and 30), and <u>joined himself</u> to a <u>citizen</u> (i.e., Satan or Baal) of a <u>foreign</u> country.

<u>C.</u> The Samaritans experienced a <u>severe famine</u> (1 <u>Kings</u> 18.2); notice that these <u>exact words</u> are used in **both** *Kings* and *Luke*.

=

The prodigal son experienced a **severe famine** (<u>Luke</u> 15.14); notice <u>again</u> that these <u>exact words</u> are used in **both** *Kings* and *Luke*.

<u>D.</u> At least some of the Samaritans <u>turned away from Baal</u> and came back to God (1 Kings 18.39).

=

The prodigal son <u>left the 'citizen</u>' and came back to his father (Luke 15.20).

Hence, by examining these parallels, it becomes quite obvious that the prodigal son is not an individual, but 'a <u>nation</u> of people from the Northern Kingdom (i.e. Samaria)'. As a note, consider that, since 10 tribes of the Northern Kingdom of Israel (i.e., the region of Samaria) split off from the 'original Kingdom consisting of 12 tribes', it would be considered 'younger' than the remaining Southern Kingdom of <u>Judah</u>; which would therefore be considered 'older'. So the <u>prodigal son</u> being 'the younger brother' corresponds to Samaria being 'the younger brother', so to speak, of the Southern Kingdom of Judah (where Jerusalem is located). And so the older son in this parable - who was still working in the field figuratively represents the Jews of the Southern Kingdom who were jealous that God was still willing to give salvation to the idolatrous Samaritans. The Jews, acting in supremacy, wanted to exclude the <u>Samaritans</u> from salvation because they <u>felt like</u> they had <u>always</u> been following God's Commandments; noting that this corresponds to Luke 15.29. Thus, just as in 'The Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard' (Matthew 20.1-16) - where 'the Jews had been laboring (i.e., performing religious deeds) in the vineyard or field since <u>early morning</u>, and thus felt <u>superior</u> to the Gentiles, wanting to <u>exclude</u> them from God's salvation' - Jesus was stating here that, even though the Samaritans (i.e., prodigal son) had practiced idolatry with golden calves and worshipped Baal, they would still be treated as equal to the Jews in terms of salvation. Furthermore, if the **Jews**, being <u>angry</u> like the **older son**, did not want to accept - or 'make merry with' - the Samaritans (i.e., the prodigal son), then they would continue to 'work in the field' because of their superior attitude, thereby being treated as last, and the Samaritans as first. As a final note, it must also be pointed out that, by this being the true interpretation of 'the prodigal son', (as per the preceding *irrefutable* parallels) the multitudes have had this story 'turned around on them' for centuries, being used by religious leaders to project unrighteous guilt and shame, while the whole time it is our religious leaders who have been blindly 'playing the role of the prodigal son'. And it is our religious leaders who God is <u>waiting for</u>, so patiently, to 'come to their senses and return to Him'. If and when our religious leaders realize this truth, they will surely understand what 'fiqurative nakedness' is, feeling great shame for condemning innocent people, when it was them the whole time who were guilty.

So after recognizing A) the true meaning of these 2 previous parables, and consequently B) that Jesus spent a great deal of time and effort directly opposing organized religion and its leaders, teaching about the evils of exclusion, supremacy, supposed sacred traditions, and man-made laws spoken in the name of God, are we to believe that Jesus 'supposedly' set up a new master <u>religion</u> - i.e., Catholicism - that was <u>more exclusive</u>, <u>more supreme</u>, and has <u>more traditions and</u> rituals than **Judaism**? Therefore we must realize that, this mindset of setting up 'a more exclusive and supreme religion' is totally contradictory to the very essence of Christ's teachings on supremacy and exclusion. In other words, this mindset is **double-minded** - as if Christ said 'I hate supremacy, but I want to start a new supreme master religion' - and hence not consistent (as per the 2 previously discussed parables) with the true persona of Christ. And, as we are utterly deceived by 'Satan renaming his evil as good', this means that Satan simply renamed 'what Judaism was 2000 years ago' with the name 'Catholicism', and backed it with 'the name and misinterpreted words of Christ'. I.e., Catholicism is merely 'a **bloated, renamed continuation** of the **Judaism** of 2000 years ago'. So to imply that Jesus' intention was to create 'a more exclusive and supreme religion' (i.e., Catholicism) than Judaism, is to imply that Jesus was an idolater (like the Pharisees and Scribes), contradicting His core teachings on *supremacy* and *exclusion* in order to induct members into a *new* elite club or master religion; which of course erroneously portrays Jesus as being like Hitler, who wanted to create a master race. Hence, the idea that 'Jesus came to establish a new, supreme, master religion' is totally and without a doubt the antithesis of His sole purpose and mission: 'To remove the sin of the WOrld' (John 1.29), thereby bringing about universal equality and peace. Note here that Jesus' sole purpose and mission is not 'forgiving our sins' - i.e., we are truly forgiven 'as we forgive others' (Matthew 6.12, and see also <u>Section 9</u>) - but rather 'removing <u>the sin</u> that <u>causes</u> division, war, and hate' so that our <u>blind</u> sinning goes into <u>remission</u>. And 'the sin of the world' and 'the sin that <u>causes</u> division, war, and hate' is IDOLATRY; which by the way is the main idea of the entire Old Testament. Thus, if all of our **religions** 'vainly swear by heaven and the name of God' - thereby committing **idolatry** by breaking, just as they did 2000 years ago, the 2nd (and consequently the 1st) Commandment - then we must come to the painful realization that we, grossly overlooking the obvious in terms of Christ's true persona, have been **deceived** by the Evil One into 'blindly starting a new, supreme master religion (i.e., Catholicism/Christianity) in the name of Jesus', when Jesus came to destroy religion (i.e., idolatry). As a note here, if you think this is impossible to believe, consider A) 'Nothing is impossible with God' (Luke 1.37 and Matthew 19.26), B) God actively hides His wisdom from men (i.e., our proud religious leaders with man-made PhD's) who believe that they are wise and 'have God all figured out' (Luke 10.21), and **C)** most Christians claim to believe in the most unbelievable act of 'the dead (i.e., Jesus) resurrecting back to life', so to be a true follower of Christ, someone must be willing to 'believe' what is impossible for most to believe'; which again is that 'Jesus came to destroy religion (i.e., idolatry)', not start a new religion... ultimately meaning that, contrary to the lie we have inherited from

our Christian Forefathers, to be 'a true follower of Christ' is to **NOT belong** to a **religion**, or participate in religious rituals.

John 1.29 says "Behold! The Lamb of God who takes away the Sin of the world!" 'The sin of the world' or idolatry (i.e., false prophets speaking falsely on God's behalf) is what causes the multitudes to blindly hate and kill each other; to 'blindly sin' while thinking that they are not sinning. And so, as idolatry is a sin that people (due to being born blind into 'the idolatrous sins of our ancestors' or 'ancestral sin') <u>unknowingly commit</u>, and would therefore '<u>not even</u> ask forgiveness for in the <u>first place</u>', it is **idolatry** that Jesus came to 'take away' or remove - which first and foremost means identifying the idolatry that people do not even know exists - thereby removing 'the cause of blind sinning', and ultimately leading to 'the overall remission of sinfulness'. That is, overall sinfulness will recede, just as cancer 'recedes' or 'goes into remission'. Remember that 'the man (i.e., our religious leaders) who commits idolatry by stealing God's name and speaking lies in His name' is 'the man who is the cause of sin' (Matthew 18.7). So it is important to understand that Jesus did not come to 'forgive us as we sin' (realizing that spiritually blind people cannot even ask forgiveness for 'something that they think is a non-sin') only to have us blindly do the same thing over and over again. Rather, He came to reveal the knowledge (i.e., 'the apocalypse') by which idolatry is truly identified, thereby leading to peace by the removal of 'what <u>causes</u> us to blindly sin' (i.e., the following of false gods). Thus again, if 'the sin' of the world is '<u>idolatry</u> and all of the **supremacies** and **exclusions** of <u>religion</u>', and Jesus came to 'remove or take away the idolatry of religion', then in plain language Jesus' sole purpose was, and still is, 'to remove or abolish religion'; not 'to begin a new, exclusive and supreme master religion as was begun with Catholicism'. Jesus' sole purpose, which will finally be fulfilled upon His return (i.e., 'the apocalypse' or 'revealing of knowledge'), is 'the destruction of all religions and all temples' - which are really 'false gods and false idols' - in order to bring an end to our 'present age of darkness' (Matthew 24.1-3) and begin 'a new age of peace and light'. Additionally, it is important to note here that, as we can clearly look around and see that 'sin (i.e., violence and oppression) has not yet gone into remission' thereby meaning that 'the sin of the world (i.e., idolatry) has also not yet been removed' - Jesus is returning with the intention of 'finishing what He started 2000 years ago'. Therefore, we must realize that everything was not completed 2000 years ago with Jesus' death on the cross (see Revelation 16.17 and 21.6 where 'things are completed' or 'done' post-resurrection), but will be completed upon Christ's return. Think about it. If everything was completed upon Christ's 1st coming, then why would Christ bother returning at all? Hence, the return of Christ is when 'the sin of the world' or 'the sin of the nations' will be removed in order to finally facilitate the remission of sin (i.e., large scale sinning ceases to take place), ultimately bringing about world peace.

Furthermore, it must be understood that, as much as the <u>Apostles</u> believed 'Jesus was the Son of God', they still <u>did not fully understand</u> that Jesus' sole purpose was 'to destroy religion'. That is, the Apostles did not fully understand that their religion (i.e., <u>Judaism</u> itself) represented a false god, and so was 'a mechanism for supremacy and exclusion responsible for division, war, and hate' that must eventually be <u>destroyed</u>. As noted in Acts 10.45 and 11.18, 'the <u>seeds</u> of supremacy and exclusion' were <u>planted so</u>

deep in the minds and consciences of the Apostles (and other Jews) that they struggled with the idea of 'the non-religious, uncircumcised Gentiles being equal (before God) to the religious, circumcised <u>Jews'</u>... even **after** they themselves had '<u>received the Holy Spirit</u>' and had spoken to Jesus for <u>3 years</u> 'face to face'. As Acts 10.45 and 11.18 say 'The believing Jews and the Apostles were astonished and <u>speechless</u> that God would give <u>salvation</u> to the <u>Gentiles</u>, just <u>as if</u> they were <u>Jews'</u>; i.e., they were astonished and speechless to realize that all of their religious rituals, sacrifices, and deeds of the law were actually meaningless to God, having nothing to do with salvation. And if you think about it, 'performing religious rituals, sacrifices, and deeds of the law in order to gain partiality in God's eyes' is essentially like 'bribing God', which is futile, as God is 'a God who shows no partiality, nor takes a bribe' (Deuteronomy 10.17). Thus, we must understand that even the Apostles were not fully allowed by God to grasp Jesus' sole purpose: 'to abolish religion and all of its rituals (i.e., bribes to show partiality which lead to a supreme mindset) in order to bring about equality and world peace', as it is religion (i.e., Satan's beautifully disguised false gods) that gives rise to 'division, war, and hate'. This message (i.e., the true **Good News**) will only be <u>fully understood</u> at 'the end of our present age of darkness' (see Matthew 24.14) when Jesus returns to reveal His knowledge (i.e., 'the apocalypse'). Until then, 'the minds and consciences of the entire world will remain under the sway of the Wicked One' (1 John 5.19).

Now we must ask, 'If Jesus came to abolish religion (which is the way most people think they should worship God), then what is true worship?' So it is fundamental to first understand that 'the true **worship** of God' = 'simply loving others as yourself'; since of course God is inside every person, and 'to love others is to love God'. But people in the past, just as today, were confused by Satan and therefore **wrongly** believed that they could show up on the Sabbath and essentially **'bribe a God** who takes no bribes', performing rituals and ceremonies to get closer to God. And so to believe this, is to believe in a beautifully devised scheme concocted by the Evil One, who has disguised himself as God, saying 'I want rituals and ceremonies'; remembering that 'God only wants kindness and mercy, not rituals and ceremonies' (Matthew 9.13). But why would God not want rituals and ceremonies? Quite simply, the rituals and ceremonies that people practiced on the Sabbath, just as the rituals and ceremonies practiced on every Sunday in today's world, promoted supremacy and exclusion, and ultimately glorified man and Satan, <u>not God</u>. We must remember that the Pharisees practiced *rituals* and ceremonies (i.e., <u>deeds of the Jewish law</u>) on the Sabbath, and claimed that 'Jesus was <u>not from God</u> because He did not observe the Sabbath' (John 9.16). But Jesus knew that their rituals and ceremonies - just as the rituals and ceremonies (i.e., sacraments or 'any deed of any religious law') in today's world - ultimately glorified man and Satan, not God; again why 'God wants kindness and mercy, **<u>not</u>** rituals, sacrifices, and ceremonies' (Matthew 9.13), realizing that rituals, sacrifices, and ceremonies project the idea that 'We have a better way of worshiping God that you', which ultimately leads to 'division, war, and hate'. Therefore, the rituals and ceremonies of religion that people have practiced for thousands of years do **not** constitute the **true worship** of God, but rather the worship of **false gods**: 'belief systems created by **man** at the suggestion of **Satan**'.

So we must understand that rituals and ceremonies do not supersede or surpass 'simply loving one another', but rather **impede** and **hinder** us from 'simply loving one another'. And we should not think that we are 'doing better' or 'going beyond' 'simply loving one another' with rituals and ceremonies, as you cannot do better than 'simply loving one another'. I.e., rituals and ceremonies only make us fall short of 'simply loving one another' as they eventually breed supremacy, **exclusion**, and the **judgment** of others who do not participate in our *rituals* and *ceremonies*, or belong to our religion. The true worship of God means 'to simply love one another', and this is what Jesus is referring to when He says "True worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth" (John 4.23). I.e. the true worshippers of God will **NOT** worship God by performing **physical** sacrifices or 'deeds of the <u>law'</u> - such as the rituals and ceremonies performed 'on Mount Gerizim or in Jerusalem' (see **John 4.21**) but will worship God spiritually by 'simply loving one another'. As Hebrews 13.16 says 'Doing good and sharing are the sacrifices that please God'. So 'to worship God in spirit and truth' = 'simply loving one another'; nothing more, nothing less. This was, and still is, the **Good News** of the **New Covenant**: no more man-made religion (i.e., false gods), rituals, circumcisions, ceremonies, sacrifices, or any deed of any religious law to receive salvation, but 'simply love one another to truly worship God and receive salvation' (see Section 12). I.e., Paul says in Romans 3.20 'No one will receive salvation (or be justified before God) by performing religious deeds of the law'. As John 1.17 essentially conveys, 'The Law of Moses, which included rituals, ceremonies, and sacrifices, represented a partial truth, but the full truth that leads to salvation was given by Jesus'. Thus, this full truth (or Good News) concerning 'truly worshipping God' is that 'there is no religion, ritual, ceremony, prayer, sacrifice, circumcision, or sacrament that can benefit one's salvation', as these things actually **impede** and **hinder** our salvation by creating and propagating supremacy, exclusion, judgment, and ultimately <u>false person</u>as of God. And this <u>full truth</u> concerning 'the <u>abolishment of religion</u> and all of its rituals and sacrifices' is <u>what</u> people must believe in when they say 'I believe in Jesus', as this mentality encompasses the true personas of Jesus and God. Furthermore, if people do not understand that 'this was and is Jesus' true persona and intention', then it is useless and pointless to say 'I believe in Jesus'. That is, to say 'I believe in Jesus' or 'I've been washed clean by the words of Christ', without knowing the true persona and true intentions of Christ, is useless, pointless, and futile, as it is like a person saying 'they love someone who **they don't know** and **have never met'**. So again, you **don't** believe in the **real** Jesus - no matter how many times your words honor Him saying 'I believe' - if you don't know that Jesus' true intentions (i.e., the <u>true</u> Good News) were to 'abolish religion and all of its rituals, sacrifices, and <u>false worship</u> services', as these things create supremacy, exclusion, and judgment (i.e., the precursors to 'division, war, and hate'); meaning of course that these things are most definitely the antithesis of the true worship of God (i.e., 'simply loving others as yourself'), and actually constitute the well disguised 'worship of Satan'.

Isaiah 1.11-14 says "Hear the word of the Lord, to <u>what purpose</u> is the <u>multitude of your sacrifices</u> to Me? I have had enough of your <u>burnt offerings</u> and bring <u>no more futile sacrifices</u>. <u>Incense</u> is an <u>abomination to Me</u>. The New Moons, the <u>Sabbaths</u>, and the calling of assemblies; I cannot endure

iniquity and the sacred meeting. Your New Moons and your appointed feasts My soul hates. They are a trouble to Me, I am weary of bearing them". Ultimately 'the purpose of the multitude of their sacrifices' was to associate themselves with God, and thereby exude the same authority and supremacy as God. I.e., they (mainly the rulers and religious leaders of Israel) repetitiously spoke (in vain) the name of God Over and Over again, thereby hypnotizing the people into doing their will, as if it was God's will. So the **hidden** purpose of their rituals, sacrifices, ceremonies and other religious deeds was to glorify themselves, not God. As Zechariah 7.5-6 says 'The priests fasted and mourned, and then ate and drank, not for God, but for themselves'; that is, to justify their positions of authority before the people, and convince the people that 'they and their rituals and sacrifices' were necessary for salvation, prosperity, peace, etc. This is why Jesus quotes Hosea 6.6 saying 'It is kindness and mercy that I want, not animal sacrifices' (Matthew 12.7). Hence, the message of Jesus and the Prophets was that religion i.e., 'rituals, sacrifices, ceremonies, sacred meetings, and circumcisions' - placed the religious leaders in an authoritative, supreme position that vainly used the name of God to maintain unrighteous control and power over the people. Additionally, the religious leaders taught their followers that 'anyone who did not bow to their authority was excluded from salvation'; i.e., Supremacists teaching supremacy and exclusion. Remember that 'the supremacy of the Jews over the Gentiles', and 'the Jew's perceived **exclusion** of the Gentiles from God's salvation', is the <u>main idea</u> of 'The Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard'. Essentially, Jesus was conveying in this parable that 'the rituals, sacrifices, ceremonies, sacred meetings, and circumcisions of religion were causing inequality by projecting supremacy and exclusion'; which in turn gives rise to 'division, war, and hate'. I.e., religion gives rise to division, war, and hate. And if you don't think that supremacy, exclusion, and the idea of a master religion leads to 'division, war, and hate', think of A) the supremacy of the Nazis (who thought they were a superior master race) over the Jews, and B) the supremacy of white slave owners (who also thought they were a superior master race) over blacks in the southern United States in the 1800s; both of which obviously led to dissention, war, and unspeakable atrocities. Thus, with Jesus trying to convey the idea that 'religious supremacy (just like racial supremacy) leads to division, war, and hate', it becomes obvious that Jesus' message was actually to <u>abolish religion</u> and <u>strip</u> the religious leaders of their <u>authority</u> (see Matthew chapter 23); something the religious leaders obviously opposed, and 'why' the religious leaders **hated** Jesus with **such passion**, and ultimately crucified Him. Think about it. The religious leaders (just as religious leaders today would) despised Jesus because He was essentially telling 'men who <u>believed</u> that they were called by the voice of God' (which was actually the voice of Satan), that they were blindly scattering for the Evil One (Luke 11.23), and that they spoke not on the authority of God, but on the authority of men and their own misguided inner desires. As Jesus says in John 7.18 "He who speaks from himself seeks his own glory". So we must understand that the purpose of 'the religious leaders performing their religious deeds and sacrifices' was so that they could maintain a position of 'being necessary in the chain of salvation' in order to satisfy their own lust for glory, supremacy, and authority; i.e., control and power. And they disguised that position as something appointed by God. So by maintaining a position of 'being necessary in the chain of salvation' - i.e., a position of supremacy - the religious leaders of Jesus' day created inequality, supremacy, and exclusion

among the people, that gave rise to 'division, war, and hate'. Thus again Jesus' true message, sole purpose and mission (i.e., the true Good News of the New Covenant) was actually to abolish religion (i.e., the idolatrous, hidden 'sin of the world') and its leaders in order to 'unite people through equality'. I.e., Jesus did not come to start a new religion, or to begin 'a new set of idolatrous rituals and ceremonies' that would only serve the hidden purpose of 'qlorifying man and Satan'.

Again, if you think this - i.e., Jesus did <u>not</u> come to start a <u>new religion</u> - is **impossible** to believe, then consider that Jesus was a Man who:

- A) did not abide by the Sabbath laws, or 'keep the Sabbath' as prescribed by man (John 9.16),
- **B)** tells us **not to go to church** (i.e., the **temple** or **synagogue**), or say long, repetitive prayers to God (Matthew 6.5-7), and
- <u>C)</u> repeatedly calls the <u>religious</u> leaders *'evil, blind guides'*, warning us <u>**not** to listen to them</u> and their **false doctrine** (Matthew 16.6).

Yet today - because the religious leaders have **hypnotized** us by 'blasphemously (although reverently) <u>repeating</u> the name of Christ over and over again', assigning to Him a <u>false persona</u> that perpetually glorifies their man-made institutions - we listen to them, blindly discarding Jesus' warnings 'not to *listen to them*', thereby blindly opposing Christ's intentions, doing all the things He says 'don't do'. So should this not make us ask the obvious question - with the understanding that it was only the religious leaders who had <u>access</u> to the Bible before the 1500s - 'What Bible have we been reading for the last 1700 to 1800 years?' What Bible paints the picture of 'a Jesus who A) loved being around the religious leaders, B) performed religious rituals and sacrifices, and C) wanted to start a new, more supreme master religion'? Therefore, we should realize that 'the version of Jesus that we have inherited from our Catholic Forefathers' is a <u>false version</u> (i.e., a <u>false persona</u>) that these vain men fabricated to make it appear as though Jesus stood side-by-side with them, approving of their abuses of power and false authoritative practices. Think about it. Jesus and the Prophets were directly <u>opposed</u> to all the <u>religious leaders</u> (see Matthew chapter 23). Yet <u>ironically</u>, all the religious leaders after Jesus' death and up to today have used 'the <u>names</u> of Jesus and the Prophets' to <u>support their</u> <u>religion</u>; to support something that Jesus <u>came to abolish</u> 2000 years ago. As a side note that tells of 'religious leaders using Christ's name to support something anti-Christ', Jesus Himself - in Matthew 11.19, not to mention at the Last Supper - says that 'He drinks alcohol (i.e., wine)', while many Christian religions are totally opposed to drinking alcohol. So these Christian religious leaders, by their association with the name of Christ, would <u>lead</u> us to believe that God does *not* approve of drinking; which is **false**, according to the actions of Jesus. Essentially, by associating themselves with Jesus and the Prophets, religious leaders (not just Christian) have made us believe that 'their ways are Christ-like', and vice versa, with Jesus and the Prophets being 'just like them'; when this is not the case at all. I.e., they have acted as though 'they would be best buddies with Jesus and the Prophets if they had lived in the same time period'; which is just like saying 'Jesus was best buddies with the Pharisees, Scribes, Chief Priests, elders, etc.' Hence, their assertions are false and totally contradictory to the true personas of Jesus and the Prophets. Here it is important to realize that today's (and surely yesterday's) religious leaders - as

much as they <u>claim</u> to be <u>different</u> than the <u>well educated</u> (in Satan's false knowledge) Pharisees and Scribes - are in fact no different than the religious leaders of 2000 years ago; they are simply false teachers and false prophets who are 'normalized in our own day'. We must ask ourselves 'Why did Jesus call uneducated, blue-collar fishermen to be His Apostles? And why did this Carpenter call fishermen and outcasts (**instead** of religious leaders who were already proficient and fluent in Scripture) to announce the Good News?' Do you think that carpenters and fishermen 2000 years ago looked different than they do today? Probably not. Therefore, it is extremely important to recognize this 'basic' contradiction in personas' that has a great deal do with the difference between pride and true humility, with 'Jesus and the Apostles' being more lower to middle class in social status, and consequently 'more <u>humble</u>, with no worldly authority', and 'the Pharisees and Scribes' being more upper class, and consequently 'more proud, arrogant, and not willing to accept or believe that their prized man-made wisdom could be wrong'; of course because they had a lot more to lose, speaking in terms of 'money, power, control, and their man-made office of false authority'. So confusingly, our religious leaders have **normalized** themselves in **our own day**, making it seem as though **'their** personas' are 'what the personas of Jesus and the Apostles would be like'. Yet, be assured that, when Jesus returns, it will be obvious that our religious leaders are quite different than the people of the past with whom they have so seamlessly associated themselves with. And, we will therefore realize that Jesus quite simply 'chose the Apostles that He chose', because they, as opposed to the religious leaders, were truly humble, not lusting after authority (i.e., control and power) to the degree that the religious leaders *lusted after authority*.

Hence we must face the hard truth that 'those evil Pharisees and Scribes who we loathe for having opposed and condemned our Savior', are actually our present day religious leaders. Yet, as they have projected 'their personas' onto 'the personas of Jesus, the Apostles, and the Prophets', they have successfully rewritten 'the personas of Jesus, the Apostles, and the Prophets' to be more like themselves, thereby normalizing themselves, and making themselves appear to be righteous. So, our religious leaders have essentially created 'fictitious prophets', 'fictitious apostles', and 'a fictitious Jesus' with 'personas resembling the religious leaders'. And what the religious leaders don't understand is that 'all of the people who they perceive as rejecting Christ, are <u>actually rejecting them</u> (i.e., the religious leaders)' because the religious leaders have <u>projected</u> their personas onto Christ, thereby portraying 'a fictitious Jesus' (which is a sort of 'composite persona' of the religious leaders as a whole) that people are **right not** to accept. We must recognize that today's religious leaders (and their forefathers) exalt 'their version of Christ, the Apostles, and the true Prophets' only to exalt themselves, yet if they had lived 2000 to 3000 years ago, they would by no means exalt Christ and the true Prophets, as they - being <u>like</u> the Pharisees and Scribes - were very much <u>opposed</u> to Christ, the Apostles, and the true Prophets; realizing here that the true Prophets usually had intentions of 'firing the religious leaders', removing them from their self-appointed office. As Jesus says to the Pharisees and Scribes (i.e., the religious leaders) "You make <u>fine tombs</u> for the Prophets, and you Claim that, **if** you had **lived during** the **time of your ancestors**, you would **not** have done **what they did** and

killed the Prophets. (But you are actually) sons (or descendants) of those who murdered the Prophets" (Matthew 23.29-31). So here Jesus was saying that the Pharisees and Scribes were the same false prophets who, if they had lived (+/-) 500 years beforehand, would have killed the real Prophets. Yet, they pretended to honor the true Prophets to receive 'the glory of being associated with a real Prophet'. Today, the same is true with our religious leaders, as they honor the true Prophets (and of course Jesus and the Apostles) of the past to receive their glory, yet would kill (i.e., discredit, squash, slander, etc.) those same Prophets (including Jesus) if they were here today. Thus, just as Satan swaps personas with Jesus to cause confusion, our religious leaders have swapped personas, confusingly making themselves out to be 'like Jesus and the Apostles', when in reality they are just like the Pharisees and Scribes who Condemned Jesus; meaning of course, anywhere we see the word 'Pharisee or Scribe' written in the Bible, we can replace it with the word 'priest, rabbi, imam, swami, monk, etc.' And so ultimately we must know that, as Jesus came to abolish religion, the leaders of Christian religions everywhere are obviously nothing like Christ, their 'supposed' Founder; realizing that their 'positions of religious authority' would not even exist if their personas were even remotely similar to 'the true persona of Christ'.

Think about it. If we can understand in today's world that a **corporation** can be **'bought out** and <u>run</u> by people who are <u>nothing like</u> its founder', then why can we not conceive that 'the very **same** thing' can easily occur within <u>a **religion**</u> over 10 to 20 centuries? Furthermore, is it so hard to believe that a religion, just like a corporation, can be a conglomerate of the personal agendas of past religious leaders or Popes (i.e., CEOs), and not a true model of the founder's original agenda? So it is important to understand that, while Jesus wanted to abolish religion, the people coming after Jesus' <u>death</u> (who we now misleadingly call 'Catholic Saints') started a <u>new</u> religion - of course using Jesus' name to receive the same glory as Jesus - that He never intended (or was not Christ's agenda); of course making the Catholic Saints (i.e., Justin, Augustine, Jerome, etc.) nothing like their 'supposed Founder', and consequently meaning that 'the agenda of today's Christianity' is actually 'a warped version of a conglomerate of personal agendas of the early Catholic Forefathers'. Realize also here that Christians, in simply 'naming themselves Christians and dividing off from the Jews' - noting that Jesus never said 'My group of followers will be named Christians' - did something that was in fact anti-Christ, as Christ came to abolish religion, not start a religion. Hence, we must know that, Jesus' original intention and agenda was to bring about peace, creating ONE people from two groups (i.e., Jews and Gentiles) by **removing** the **religious rituals**, or 'Jewish deeds of the law' (i.e., the Jewish religion itself), that kept them divided (Ephesians 2.15; see also John 4.21-24 on 'the removal of rituals and other man-made worship practices'). But the false prophets, who we now recognize as 'the Forefathers of Catholicism', took Jesus' words and misinterpreted them, thereby doing exactly the opposite of His entire existence, causing division, not unity. I.e., the Catholic Forefathers created 'a new batch of manmade deeds of the law' or 'man-made ordinances' - which we now recognize as 'supposedly holy, Jesusapproved sacraments' - by which members would use to practice supremacy, exclusion, and judgment, saying 'By these sacraments, we, and we alone, will receive salvation'. To clarify, the false

prophets of early Catholicism - as well as their present day descendants - said 'There is no salvation outside Catholicism'; which is exactly what the Jews of Jesus' day said, and therefore exactly the supreme mindset that Jesus opposed, as this supreme mindset breeds 'division, war, and hate'. So, as much as Christianity/Catholicism thinks and believes that they stand for unity, they have actually been tricked by Satan into 'causing and propagating division', thereby unknowingly and blindly disobeying and opposing Christ Himself, while thinking, just like Adam and Eve, that they are obeying and **honoring** Christ. Realize here that, by 'instituting sacraments in Christ's name that He would actually oppose', the Forefathers of Catholicism created 'an opposite, false persona of Christ', which is actually 'the persona of Satan', the Antichrist, making 'the entity of Christianity' not of 'the true identity of Christ'. Thus, in order to truly start uncovering the dirt (i.e., lies) that is covering 'the source of what keeps us divided, at war, and hating each other for no apparent reason', we must recognize that 'people who immediately came after Christ and the Apostles' spoke lies in the name of Christ for their own glory, and began a religion (i.e., Catholicism) that was **NEVER** the intention of Christ, or in keeping with the true persona of Christ. To be clear, the Catholic Forefathers who came after Christ (i.e., they <u>never knew</u> Christ) began 'the new religion of <u>Catholicism/Christianity</u>', which actually opposed Christ's true intentions and agenda, making them false prophets, or antichrists.

Coincidentally, if you look closely, this appears to be the very same thing that happened with **Buddhism** and Islam. That is, false prophets who came immediately after Buddha and Muhammad spoke lies in their names in order to create new religions that would give these false prophets 'false authority, supremacy, and glory'. Hence, false prophets (i.e., Buddhist Forefathers and Muslim Forefathers) did just as the Catholic Forefathers, as they changed Buddha and Muhammad's original intentions, it order to **redefine** their **true** personas so that these 'false, redefined personas of Buddha and Muhammad' were more like 'a <u>composite</u> <u>persona</u> made up of the false prophets' personas'; which of course supported the propagation of a religion (i.e., **Buddhism** and **Islam**) that placed those false prophets in a position of authority. We must realize that, essentially, 'Buddha was to Hinduism' as 'Jesus was to Judaism'. Just as Jesus wanted to remove religious leaders from their positions which made 'them and their deeds of the law' necessary for salvation, Buddha also asserted that 'the Brahmins (i.e., religious leaders) and their rituals were **not** necessary for man to receive salvation, or converse and connect with God (i.e., Brahman)'. And just like Jesus' message to the Jews, Buddha's message was one of simple **equality** that *rejected* the **Indian caste system** (of which the **Hindu** religious leaders were 'at the **top** of') and the inherited mindset of supremacy and exclusion based on birthright. I.e., the Jews (as well as many religions **today**) believed that 'just being **born** a Jew made them, and them alone, **chosen** for salvation, supremely thinking that the Gentiles were excluded from salvation'. So we must use our common sense and think, why would Buddha A) oppose the supremacy of the Hindu religious hierarchy who placed themselves between God and man (i.e., making themselves 'necessary mediators in the chain of salvation'), and B) assert (just as the New Covenant asserts) that 'every man and woman has a direct relationship with God', then Supposedly contradict himself by instituting 'a rival Buddhist hierarchy' that, whether spoken or unspoken, places themselves (i.e., Buddhist monks) in a position of being <u>needed</u> by the multitudes in order to ensure a <u>divine connection</u> and <u>receive salvation</u>? Note here that, if Buddhist monks insist that they are <u>not needed</u>, then what is the <u>purpose</u> of their existence and making 'that existence' known to other humans? Therefore, quite simply, the idea of 'a <u>Buddhist</u> religion with religious leaders in a <u>supreme</u>, <u>authoritative position just like</u> the Hindu religious leaders' <u>opposes</u> and <u>contradicts</u> Buddha himself, as he essentially stressed <u>equality</u> and 'man's <u>direct relationship</u> with God', which is of course <u>hindered</u> and <u>influenced</u> by religious leaders who erroneously claim (just as all false prophets) that 'they are <u>more in touch with God</u> than the <u>common man'</u>; remembering that the Pharisees and Scribes claimed the <u>same</u> thing to Jesus. And so, by examining <u>Buddha's basic</u> <u>message</u> (i.e., 'man does <u>not need</u> the intercession of religious leaders, as he has a <u>direct relationship</u> with God'), it becomes obvious that 'the religion of <u>Buddhism'</u>, just like Catholicism/Christianity, was <u>created by false prophets</u> who came <u>after Buddha</u>, attaching themselves to his <u>name</u> in order to receive praise and honor from men. Think about it. <u>Buddha opposed religion</u>, so <u>why would he create a new religion</u>? Thus, the idea of starting a new religion opposes 'the true persona of Buddha', meaning Buddha did <u>not</u> start Buddhism, but rather 'false prophets (i.e., <u>anti-Buddhas</u>) who came <u>after</u> Buddha' started Buddhism.

Similar to Jesus and Buddha, Muhammad's original intentions were **not** to start a **new** religion. In fact Muhammad - after leaving his upbringing, which involved 'the worship of false gods' - simply wanted to follow in the footsteps of Christ and Moses, rejecting false gods, or 'false belief systems that did not describe the true persona God'. Realizing that we have redefined the word 'religion', as it was used in biblical times to simply mean 'kindness and treating others with equality, the same way you want to be treated' (see also James 1.27), the Quran states "The same religion (i.e., belief system encompassing simple <u>kindness</u> and <u>equality</u>, and <u>opposing</u> rituals and sacrifices for salvation) Allah (i.e., God) established for you, He enjoined upon Noah... and what We enjoined upon Abraham and Moses and **Jesus**: namely that you should remain <u>steadfast in religion</u>, and **make no divisions** therein" (Surat Ash-Shuraa 42:13). So, knowing that Jesus wanted to abolish religion, as its sacrifices and rituals (by creating *supremacy*) ultimately cause *violence* and *oppression* - which are the opposites of *kindness* and equality, thereby making them 'belief systems encompassing false personas of God' (i.e., false gods) - it is obvious by this proceeding Quran quote (realizing Jesus's message of 'kindness, not sacrifice' was the perfection of Moses' Law) that Muhammad had no intention of creating another religion, as this ('kindness, not religion') was the mindset of Christ that Allah instructed people 'not to divide away from'. Hence, we must realize that, by early Catholicism, with their many rituals and false sacrifices, obscuring Jesus' true message and persona (i.e., that 'true religion' = 'simple kindness, not sacrifices or rituals'), they opened the door for people to **stray** from Christ's true teaching, leading to the **formation** of the **new** religion of Islam; of course by false prophets **after** Muhammad's death. Note also here that, Islam, just like Protestantism, has their own 'rituals or deeds of the law in disquise' (such as 'praying towards Mecca') that Jesus would have opposed, and they also unknowingly worship hidden idols (such as their <u>temples themselves</u> and <u>Mecca</u> itself), as these are all <u>representative</u> of a false belief system (i.e., a false god) that opposes 'the true persona of Allah'. So 'the religion of Christ' - or 'religion that is **not a religion at all by today's definition'** - which stressed that 'kindness and equality, not sacrifices or rituals, was all that God required for salvation', can be said to personify God's true nature,

making this '<u>religion that is not a religion at all</u>' synonymous with the one true Christ and the one true God, and the 'religion' that Allah instructed Muhammad '<u>not to divide from</u>'; which again means that the **formation** of 'the religion of Islam', according to the Quran, **opposes** Allah Himself.

Hence, it must be reiterated that any belief system (such as the religions of Islam, Catholicism, etc. in today's world) that promotes the supremacy and 'unkind nature' of 'no salvation outside of their particular religion' represents a false god. So, as Islam promotes and is synonymous with 'this supremacy, and consequential violence and oppression that supremacy breeds', the religion of Islam itself (just like Judaism itself) is simply a false god that Muhammad never would have had anything to do with. As the Quran states, 'Muhammad's intention was to join himself to a correct religion (i.e., a belief system of simple kindness and equality), which was the way of Abraham, who did not join false gods with the one true God' (Surat Al-An'am 6:161). And if we can recognize that Islam is 'one of Satan's beautifully disquised false gods' which he has tricked people into 'joining with the name of God', then we can understand that 'the religion of Islam itself' is in direct opposition to the **Quran**, and directly contradicts Muhammad's true intentions. So knowing that Islam (including its 'deeds of the law in <u>disquise</u> and <u>hidden idols</u>) represents supremacy and its consequential effects of violence, hate, **bloodshed,** and **oppression**, we know that <u>Islam</u> is synonymous with '<u>a false persona of Allah</u>' (i.e., a false god) that Muhammad, according to the Quran, Never would have joined or associated with 'the true persona of Allah'; realizing again that it was the false prophets who came after Muhammad (just like the false prophets coming <u>after</u> Jesus and Buddha) who were responsible for <u>creating 1st</u>, 'a false persona of **Muhammad** that **approved** of these false prophet's supremacy and unkindness', and thereby 2nd, 'a false persona of Allah', who of course approved of this 'false persona of Muhammad'. Remember, Satan will 'assume any good or righteous identity in order to easily deceive the multitudes into unknowingly following his evil agenda'. Hence, we can be assured that Satan has stolen 'the name of Muhammad', spoken lies in Muhammad's name through false prophets, and thereby instituted laws, doctrine, and beliefs that are not at all consistent with Muhammad's (or Allah's) true persona. Note here that, as Muhammad did *not* read or write, the Quran represents 'what people other than Muhammad wrote down' (just as 'people other than Jesus' wrote the New Testament), meaning that the Quran (just as the New and Old Testaments) is 'as close to accurate as we have', yet still surely being imperfect in terms of accurately portraying Muhammad's true persona; just as any person reading a biography on themselves (written by 'someone other than themselves') would surely not agree with everything that was written about them. So we can say that Muhammad's true persona and intentions can be possibly best seen in his creation of the 1st Islamic state of Medina, as Muhammad, trying to promote <u>equality</u> and <u>unity</u> (not the supremacy seen in Islam, and especially in the actions of <u>ISIS</u>), created a nation where people were not persecuted for practicing their religions; of course realizing that, while Muhammad was striving to practice 'the non-religious religion of Christ', his religious tolerance was potentially a first step towards promoting equality and unifying people of different tribes, not persecuting them for their ignorance of 'what true religion really is' (i.e., 'true religion' = 'simple kindness, not rituals and sacrifices'). So believe it or not, Muhammad, by trying to create a place of *unity*, *equality*, and *acceptance* for all *people* (including <u>women</u>), *tribes*, and *religions*, was <u>essentially</u>

creating a precursor to the United States. Thus, we need to come to the difficult truth that, false prophets, coveting the glory of these true Prophets, came along after Jesus, Buddha, and Muhammad to create, by the rewriting of these true Prophet's personas, 'the false belief systems' or false gods which we now recognize by the names 'Catholicism/Christianity, Buddhism, and Islam'; which of course are ultimately 'false personas of the one true God (i.e., Brahman, Allah, etc.)', as they promote supremacy, exclusion, hate, bloodshed, and oppression. Concerning covetous people, such as the false prophets who have created false gods in the names of Jesus, Buddha, and Muhammad in order to deceive the multitudes, 2 Peter 2.1-3 says "But there were (and will be) false prophets among the people, even as there will be false teachers among you, who will secretly bring in destructive heresies, and many will follow their destructive ways. By covetousness they will exploit you with deceptive words".

Aside from the Bible (see Revelation 12.9) telling us that 'the whole world will be deceived by Satan', how is it possible that multitudes of people can be **deceived** into **blindly** following Satan's **false gods** (i.e., our religions)? As mentioned earlier, normalization in our own time and place causes us to be complacent to 'real sinfulness'. We must realize here that, just as the Samaritans were born into 'worshiping a golden calf', thinking it was completely normal, as the golden calf had 'the name of God' associated with it, we too worship images of Jesus, thinking it is completely normal, as 'the name of Jesus (i.e., Truth)' is associated with those images. So, as we are born blind into 'the man-made rationalizations of our blatant violations of God's Primary Commandment', they seem quite normal and innocuous; yet be assured that Jesus will return to destroy all of our highly abnormal 'Jesus images and idols', as they represent 'unfathomable lies spoken about His true persona'... lies that we think represent truth. Therefore, we must not overlook the simplest aspect which facilitates this 'normalization and rationalization of our blatant idolatry': the phenomenon of 'herd mentality' or 'everyone's doing it'. Think about it. If only one or two people were worshiping a golden calf, would the other Samaritans feel compelled to also worship the golden calf? No, these one or two people would be looked at as 'freaks' or 'crazies'. But, realizing that 'a cult has a negative connotation, and seems abnormal because it is just a small group of people', our blatant idolatry is ignored, and even thought of as *righteous, holy,* and *virtuous* in OUT OWN day because 'a <u>big enough herd</u> is doing it', thereby projecting a positive, normal connotation on our highly abnormal, Satan-like actions; which of course is no doubt helped along by <u>renaming</u> our '<u>big cults</u>' with the **well-respected name** of a '<u>religion</u>' or 'faith'. Note also here that normal people in today's world who oppose the idolatry of our religions are looked at as <u>abnormal</u> by the multitudes (i.e., herds), just as **Jesus** was viewed as being <u>abnormal</u> (i.e., 'out of His mind', Mark 3.21) 2000 years ago because the Jewish multitude had also 'normalized and rationalized their idolatrous abnormalities'.

Therefore, we must learn to look at <u>idolatry</u> on a <u>large</u>, <u>normalized</u>, <u>macro scale</u> (i.e., herds, multitudes, nations, and 'entire religions as a whole'). I.e., idolatry is **not** on the scale of <u>100</u> people, but rather <u>100,000,000</u> people, making <u>idolatry</u> = '<u>big sin</u>, with infinite ramifications', while all other sins are somewhat 'small and finite' compared to idolatry; realizing here why Jesus said 'Blasphemy (i.e., idolatry

by breaking the 2nd Commandment) is the <u>sin</u> that <u>will not be forgiven</u>' (Luke 12.10). Idolatry is hard to identify on 'an interpersonal, micro level' in the <u>short term</u>, and therefore it must be analyzed on 'an international, macro level' over the <u>long term</u>. So at the micro level, an individual will <u>struggle with recognizing</u> idolatry because it is generally not at the level of 'one <u>man</u> to another at <u>one point</u> in time', but rather 'one <u>group</u> (or nation) to another over an <u>extended period</u> of time'. That is, many people will try to understand idolatry on a small, <u>interpersonal</u> level, but one or two people acting <u>alone</u> cannot cause widespread desolation, as it is only when many people (truly thinking their actions are normal and God-like, just as Adam and Eve) start acting together and <u>in unison</u> that 'nations start to <u>destroy</u> other nations'. It is only when <u>large herds</u> of people act in unison that they <u>Stampede</u> over everything from individuals, to small resistance groups, to even <u>other large herds</u> of people. And so, remembering that idolatry is 'the sin of the <u>world</u> that Jesus came to remove', with the true Prophets always addressing kings and multitudes of people, <u>idolatry</u> is essentially 'the sin of <u>nations</u>, not necessarily individuals'.

Idolatry - while <u>caused</u> by the '<u>individual</u> hidden kings' - would not be quite so sinful if it were not for 'large groups of people' or 'nations' blindly following the hidden kings into war. Think about the content of the Old Testament. For the most part, it was on a large scale speaking about 'rulers of nations' and 'nations at war with other nations'; not necessarily 'individuals feuding with other individuals'. And remember Moses was the <u>ruler</u> of a nation consisting of well over **1 million** people, just as 'Adam and Eve' and Noah were rulers over large groups of people; not to mention King David, King Solomon, and of course 'the King of kings', Jesus. So idolatry is 'the sin of nations and the rulers of those nations', and not so much 'the sin of individual, non-leaders'. I.e., idolatry is on a 'macro level', not a 'micro level'. Hence we must realize that, many things Jesus said (i.e., Matthew 5.27-30, see Section 2 for explanation) were mistakenly taken as targeting 'individual followers', while it was really targeted at 'the **leaders** who <u>corrupted</u> the **followers**' (i.e., **'eyes'** of the body), <u>causing</u> 'the entire body or herd of people' to blindly sin (see Matthew 18.6-9). That is, if the leaders are corrupted, so are the followers; therefore Jesus focused on the leaders, as this was 'the big picture', so to speak. Now of course we must understand that Satan also focuses his attention on the leaders, planting his 'seeds of error' in the highest places to yield the largest crop of unknowing blind followers (who no doubt fight and kill for one of Satan's beautifully disguised false gods), thereby causing maximum desolation. Here it helps to think that 'one acorn can produce an entire forest of oak trees, potentially populating the whole earth'. Since this is true, then we know that, if Satan gets one of his leaders to 'take root', then that 'bad tree' (or false prophet) can produce 'many, many other bad trees', all coming from one 'bad seed', thereby causing untold amounts of spiritual, emotional, mental, and physical 'violence and enslavement' that is long-lasting and self-propagating (just like the oak tree) for untold generations; realizing here why Moses used 'a tree' to represent 'a false prophet in the Garden of Eden'. And so it is 'the individual religious leaders acting as Satan's hidden kings' (who are actually unknowing puppets, thereby being unknowing *pawns*) that is at the <u>root</u> of the 'macro level, international sin' of idolatry, inciting largescale 'division, war, and hate' in the names of God and Jesus for countless, untold generations.

If you look around and watch the news, you will see that <u>religion</u> is the <u>'root'</u> reason **why** we fight each other today. I.e., <u>religion</u> gives rise to <u>'division</u>, <u>war</u>, <u>and hate'</u>. And we must realize that this is so

because the religious leaders **influence** the mindset of society in terms of 'what is true **right**' and 'what is true wrong', with different religious leaders all teaching 'many different false versions of true right and true wrong' (i.e., many different false personas of God), making us all blindly fight and kill each other to protect 'varying false versions of God' (i.e., religions or false gods). In other words, since the religious leaders are 'spiritually blind' (like Adam and Eve) and do not have the knowledge of 'true right' and 'true wrong', they mislead the people into 'error which is disguised as righteousness', thereby creating senseless 'division, war, and hate'. Now we must consider that, by either consciously or subconsciously planting their seeds in the minds of elected officials (or kings and dictators) from the time of childhood, the religious leaders thereby rule over the elected officials without ever having to be elected by the people; which of course <u>nullifies</u> any possibility of 'true separation of religion and state'. Hence, as already mentioned, the religious leaders are hidden kings of the people by **indirect rule**; realizing here that 'the tree of knowledge' essentially acted as 'a hidden king to Adam and Eve', indirectly ruling, thereby causing them to abuse and enslave their people. It helps here to think about a **chess board**. Is it not coincidental that there are **2 bishops** (i.e. religious leaders) positioned on either side, right next to the king and queen so as to whisper into their ears as hidden kings? Realize here too that, the bishops move exclusively in a diagonal fashion, or indirectly, and not 'head on' as with the other pieces (generally speaking).

So our hidden kings - blindly led by Satan - work their idolatrous practices from 'behind the scenes', indirectly influencing our elected officials, and consequently our laws. In this respect, the religious leaders, as hidden kings, can be compared to an <u>unseen 'undertow'</u> or '<u>rip current'</u> in open water. An <u>undertow</u> (or undercurrent) can 'move you all the way down the beach <u>without even being aware</u> that you have been taken far away'; i.e., it moves you in such a way that you don't even notice. Likewise, a <u>rip current</u> can 'draw you out to sea and <u>drown you</u> under <u>seemingly safe</u> swimming conditions'. Therefore, by their **hidden influence** or **undertow** on our elected officials (or **kings** and **dictators**), our religious leaders, the hidden kings of the earth, can move us to places we didn't even realize. And when left unchecked for centuries, hidden kings can create an unseen rip current of man-made laws (that are disguised as God's laws) capable of **drowning nations** of people in senseless wars; which of course are created out of nothing more than 'proud ignorance based on man-made traditions', and 'lust for power'. So we must realize that, just as in Jesus' day when the Jewish religious leaders incited 'the crucifixion of Christ by Roman soldiers', our hidden kings get us to blindly fight each other while they 'keep their hands clean of any bloodshed'. I.e., hidden kings incite wars, they don't fight wars. Thus we must understand that our religious leaders practice mind control, using A) their temple 'power positions', B) images of Christ (among others false idols), and C) the names of God and Jesus, thereby acting as a hidden influence on our governments and laws, which in turn essentially makes them hidden kings who 'rule from behind the scenes', with Satan being 'the ultimate hidden king' (or dictator) who leads our blind religious leaders around; of course by impersonating God and/or Jesus.

So if our religious leaders (i.e., hidden kings) are inciting war - in a hidden way that is disguised with 'words of false peace' - then we must recognize that our 'freedom of religion' is actually 'the **freedom to incite war'**. And so, as our *minds* and *consciences* (and ultimately our *physical bodies*) are **enslaved** to 'the false gods that we call our religions', **blindly** fighting in wars to protect 'Satan and his laws' - all while thinking that we are protecting 'God and His laws' - we can see that 'freedom of <u>religion</u>' is a <u>contradiction</u> in terms. Think about it. If <u>religion</u> is 'the <u>underlying cause</u> of worldwide hate, oppression, starvation, homelessness, violence, bloodshed, division, and some form of either spiritual or physical enslavement', then, as these things all are in direct opposition to 'a free and peaceful society', 'religion and freedom' should not be paired in the same sentence; which of course triggers our minds to wrongly assume that they are synonyms. In other words (remembering here that the 1st Commandments says 'I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of slavery. You shall have no other gods before Me.'), 'religion' = 'the enslavement to false gods', so by claiming that 'In a free society, we are free to practice religion', it misleadingly draws the conclusion in people's minds that 'practicing religion contributes to peace and freedom'; which is Wrong, as 'practicing religion contributes to war and both spiritual and physical slavery'. Realize here that, by practicing spiritual enslavement of Southern leaders (who themselves practiced normalized physical enslavement), the Catholic Pope helped catalyze the United States Civil War. And so, knowing that 'religions' are 'false gods that enslave', while claiming to set people free, we must recognize that 'freedom of religion' is a contradiction in terms where 'freedom' and 'religion' are antonyms, not synonyms, that should not be paired in the *same* sentence; which of course <u>misleads</u> people to believe that 'they <u>both</u> stand for the same thing', and is like pairing 'freedom with tyranny' then implying that they both stand for 'peace, liberty, and happiness'. Therefore, as religion is ultimately 'the well disguised enslavement to man, Satan, and any of his false gods', 'freedom of religion' actually translates as 'freedom to enslave', cloaking that enslavement with 'the name of God' and 'the name of liberty'... ultimately meaning that 'freedom of religion **gives rise** to the **destruction** of freedom'.

1 Peter 2.16 says 'Being free, you should not use your liberty as a cloak for vice'. Or, pertaining to 'freedom of religion', 'Don't use your freedom (of religion) to secretly enslave others'. And 2 Peter 2.19 says 'While false teachers and false prophets promise people freedom, they themselves are slaves of corruption who draw vulnerable people (who are trying to escape) back into slavery'. Likewise, our religious leaders today 'pound the table', fighting for our (cleverly including themselves with their followers) religious liberty and freedom, as if 'religious freedom = true freedom and liberty'. But the fact is that, by them fighting for 'supposed' freedom and liberty (i.e., freedom of religion), they are actually fighting for 'their continued right and freedom to secretly enslave people to themselves'; again making 'freedom of religion' translate as 'the freedom (by law) to enslave'... of course disguising that enslavement with the names 'God' and 'true freedom'. Thus, remembering that 'words and names are utterly deceiving', we must come to the realization that 'freedom of religion' is our 'Achilles' heel', and America's (or any country's) fatal flaw (or 'the crack in America's Liberty Bell'), as freedom of religion actually allows for 'the destruction of true freedom and liberty', all while

cleverly hiding behind 'the <u>name</u> of true freedom and liberty' (and of course 'the <u>name</u> of the <u>God</u> of true freedom and liberty'); ultimately meaning that we must practice 'freedom <u>from</u> religion', <u>not</u> 'freedom <u>of</u> religion' in order to have <u>true</u> freedom. And we must <u>unlearn</u> the lies which our hidden kings have taught us, making us wrongly believe that 'freedom of religion' is <u>essential</u> for '<u>true</u> peace, love, freedom, liberty, and happiness', as the whole time it has been the <u>One thing</u> (i.e., Achilles' heel or fatal flaw) that has <u>threatened</u> 'true peace, love, freedom, liberty, and happiness'. Remember, Jesus came to 'proclaim <u>liberty</u> to the captives, and <u>open the prison</u> to those who are bound, oppressed, and enslaved' (Isaiah 61.1). With Jesus' message being 'kindness and mercy, <u>not religion</u>' (Matthew 12.7) and that 'true worshipers <u>do not perform religious rituals and ceremonies</u>' (John 4.20-24), 'us (i.e., the captives) being set free from our <u>prisons</u> of serving Satan's false gods' depends on us practicing 'freedom <u>from</u> religion', and washing from our minds the <u>false idea</u> that 'freedom <u>of</u> religion creates or supports, in any way, <u>true</u> peace, love, freedom, liberty, and happiness'; ultimately realizing here that 'freedom of religion' only <u>propagates</u> 'the many <u>false personas</u> of God' which keep humanity in 'a dark <u>prison</u> of enslavement and bondage'.

So whether we realize it or not, if **religion** is essentially 'the hidden, normalized, and socially accepted (due to name association with God) practices of supremacy, exclusion, and enslavement' - which are all basically forms of hate and prejudice (i.e., prejudgment) - then 'freedom of religion' essentially translates as 'the **freedom** to practice **hate** and **prejudice**'. In other words, our religions represent 'socially accepted hate' and 'socially accepted prejudice', as this 'hate and prejudice' is normalized and kept hidden by use of 'the name of God'; which means that 'freedom of religion' is actually propagating, in 'the hidden, unseen realm', hate and prejudice. And so we say 'We love', but it is actually hate (i.e., hidden hate), and we say 'We want equality', but it's actually supremacy (i.e., hidden supremacy such as 'We know God better than you', 'Salvation is only through our religion', etc.), thereby making 'religion' 'the last great prejudice' that we must conquer to have true love and true equality; leading of course to true freedom and true peace. Hence, we have essentially hidden and disguised our hate and prejudice with the names of God and Jesus, thereby allowing our 'religious hate and prejudice' to be accepted, and actually exalted; with all of this hidden, normalized, and socially accepted 'hate and prejudice' being **blindly propagated** by our 'freedom of religion' (i.e., 'the freedom to practice hate and prejudice'). Think about it. A person of 'religion A' says 'People who don't convert to my religion are going to <u>hell'</u>, as if 'religion A' has a <u>cure</u> for the <u>diseased</u> people of 'religion B (or of <u>no</u> religion)'. We wonder then, 'Where does the hate come from, I was only trying to help, offering (by of course freedom of religion) others our cure? I am serving God by prejudging and CONdemning them, right?' This problem is further compounded when a person of 'religion B' simultaneously prejudges and condemns a person of 'religion A' if they do not convert to 'religion B'. So now both people, from both religions, look at each other and say (whether **spoken** or **unspoken**) 'That poor soul is going to **hell**'... for no reason at all except for the blind acceptance of the lies (i.e., prejudgments) that each one received from their religious forefathers. So we must ask the simple question, 'If **both** people are serving 'a God' who prejudges and condemns others for **no reason** at all, is it not possible that 'the God' they both

serve is 'a <u>false god</u>' (i.e., Satan)'?' Thus, neither person realizes that they have been tricked by Satan - 'the false god' who poses as 'the real God' - into <u>hating</u> and being <u>prejudiced</u> for <u>no reason</u> at all.

Neither person realizes that they have fallen victim to the <u>accepted, normalized</u>, and <u>exalted hate</u> and <u>prejudice</u> created by Satan's false gods (i.e., our man-made religions); which has been marketed to us as being 'of the <u>true persona</u> of God'. And ultimately, neither person realizes that they have been led astray in error by the 'hidden <u>undertow</u>' of our <u>hidden kings</u>: Satan's blind unknowing servants. So as much as each person says that 'they <u>love</u> in the name of <u>God</u>', the truth is that 'they <u>hate</u> in the name of their false god (i.e., their religion)', disguising their religious hate and prejudice towards others with the <u>name</u> of God (i.e., disguising hate with 'the name of love'), and doing so freely and openly, facilitated by 'freedom of religion'. As a note here, also consider that many Christians, by 'hating while professing the <u>name</u> of Christ', are practicing the <u>height of irony</u>, 'condemning many innocent men in the name of a condemned innocent Man'.

Furthermore, if we can recognize that 'freedom of religion' (i.e., our 'right' as free Americans to practice religion) actually translates to 'the freedom to practice hate and prejudice in the name of a false god', then we can ultimately write the equation:

'freedom of religion' = 'the freedom to worship false gods'

And recalling that 'freedom of religion' is America's fatal flaw, it in fact proves itself to be the very antithesis of 'the foundation of America' (thereby being its fatal flaw), as you Cannot have 'the freedom to worship multiple false gods' and then expect to have 'one unified nation under one **God'**. That is, these 2 **core** American ideals - 'the freedom to worship multiple false gods' and 'one nation under one God' - are in direct contradiction to one another (not to mention, in direct violation of the 1st Commandment), thereby 'undermining the foundation of our nation', and threatening to 'destroy it from within' (that is, 'at its core'). Think about it. How can we say '2 opposing thoughts in the same thought' (such as 'I like blue, but I hate blue') and then believe that they make any sense. So here it is like saying 'I believe that following one God is the only way to ensure one unified <u>nation</u>, but I believe that I can simultaneously follow <u>other gods</u> (i.e., our religions) and still expect to live in one unified nation'; which is a nonsense statement. So surely as the hate and prejudice propagated by 'our right as Americans to worship false gods' will (and already has) ultimately cause division, it is impossible to continue 'freely worshiping multiple false gods' while double mindedly believing that this mindset can <u>sustain</u> a country that is founded on the idea of 'one unified nation, indivisible **only** under **one** God'. Thus, the only way to reconcile this 'core contradiction' is to stop 'the freedom to worship false gods' - as this 'freedom' produces 'division' - and truly follow one God, thereby truly being 'united and indivisible'.

To reiterate what has been previously said, 'freedom of religion' translates to 'the freedom of our religious leaders to enslave our minds and consciences to them (by of course vainly speaking falsely on God's behalf), thereby causing (as hidden kings) us to blindly divide, make war, and hate'. So

ultimately, as false teachers and false prophets, our religious leaders - keeping us enslaved to 'their many false personas of God which resemble themselves' (a.k.a. 'our religions') - have tricked us into being **dependent** on (i.e., enslaved to) **them**, as if 'dependency on them and God' are one in the **same**. Or, by telling double tongue lies, our religious leaders have tricked us into 'worshiping man' by disguising it as 'the worship of God', essentially (decoded, in plain language) saying 'There is no salvation without us, the religious leaders', and 'We are necessary in the chain of salvation'; noting that, if they truly believed that 'they are not necessary', then they would all be willing to retire tomorrow... which they by no means would do. So we must recognize that 'the simplest way to identify if a teacher speaks <u>truthfully</u> or <u>falsely</u>' is based on 'whether or not he (and the institution he represents) <u>claims</u> to be <u>necessary</u>'. Hence, a <u>true teacher</u> says '<u>You don't need me</u>'. It's that simple. A <u>true teacher</u> sets you free; he teaches you 'to fish' so that you never have to ask him for a fish again. A true teacher teaches independence and true freedom. That is, a true teacher teaches spiritual freedom, simply saying 'Go directly to God, and **bypass** all men in between you and God because "Cursed is the man <u>who **trusts**</u> in man"" (Jeremiah 17.5); noting that, in addition to spiritual freedom, a true teacher teaches and promotes A) being free of debt and mortgages, B) being free of medicines and doctor dependency, and C) the independence of having your own land and dwelling, being able to provide and produce your own **food** and **water**. But, just as a <u>cunning salesman</u> will make you believe that you **can't live** without him or his products and services, a false teacher says 'You need me, you can't live without me, and you can't be saved without me' (realizing here that these things are usually unspoken, yet implied). A false teacher disguises 'hurt as help' (i.e., 'evil as good', Isaiah 5.20) to ensure their own glory. Or, a false teacher 'helps people in order to enslave people'; i.e., 'helps' to create slaves of indebtedness. A false teacher <u>deceptively</u> says 'I will <u>fish **for** you</u> and give you a fish every time you <u>COME back</u> to me. I will give you (especially the poor) food and shelter so that you will be indebted, enslaved, and loyal to me and my institution'. A false teacher wants their charity to be known, while a true teacher 'does not even let his left hand know that his right hand did a charitable deed'; realizing that, in order to not be seen as taking credit for their charity, false teachers have their blind servants 'sound the charity trumpet' for them (Matthew 6.2-3). And ultimately a false teacher 'holds the key of knowledge' (Luke 11.52) to always 'keep the upper hand' and 'keep themselves in demand and needed'. Think here how certain teachers or professionals (i.e., doctors, architects, contractors, engineers, etc.) always <u>purposefully</u> keep their techniques '<u>obscure</u> and <u>mysterious</u>' so as to always keep everyone in awe, thinking that they are 'geniuses who weave magic spells', while they are many times just full of themselves and abrasively arrogant. But a true teacher freely gives 'the key of knowledge', doing their best to **simplify** knowledge and information; **not convoluting** knowledge and information, as false teachers do, so as to keep themselves necessary. Thus a false teacher, keeping himself 'needed', teaches '<u>dependence</u> on <u>himself</u>' that is <u>disguised</u> as '<u>dependence</u> on <u>God</u>', thereby practicing <u>slavery</u> that is <u>disguised</u> as <u>freedom</u>. But a <u>true teacher</u> teaches <u>independence</u>, quite simply saying 'You <u>don't need</u> me', thereby promoting true freedom and personal liberty. And so by teaching us 'dependence on themselves' - or teaching us that 'we <u>need</u> them' - our religious leaders are in fact <u>false teachers</u>, and their religion is <u>not freedom</u>, it is <u>slavery</u>; remembering that our 'freedom of religion' is ultimately 'the

freedom of our religious leaders to <u>enslave</u> our minds, consciences, and <u>entire beings to them'</u>, keeping us all captive in an <u>unseen</u>, <u>spiritual prison</u>.

Therefore, knowing that our religious leaders have, for thousands of years, made up 'false gods resembling themselves' - with which they have used to create a multitude of slaves and servants who need them for salvation - we can ultimately recognize that 'the names of our false gods with which we are affiliated' are really the Only thing that keeps humanity divided. I.e., names such as 'Jew, Catholic, Protestant, Christian, Muslim, Hindu, and Buddhist' describe false gods (i.e., the belief systems created by false prophets) that do not even exist - just as Baal, Asherah, Chemosh, Milcom, etc. (not to mention Greek and Roman false gods such as Athena and Jupiter), did not even exist, but were **simply 'names** with false doctrine attached to them' by which men enslaved other men - meaning the only thing separating a Jew from a Catholic is simply a silly name barrier assigned to us by our blind religious forefathers. And so it is imperative to realize that Satan uses simple name barriers such as Christian, Muslim, Jew, and Hindu, to create a stronghold of division and exclusion deep in a person's subconscious mind. Think about it. If Satan can succeed at getting the name of Christian, Muslim, Jew, or Hindu to actually be a part of our personal identity (i.e., who we are as people), then we will be more likely to exclude others who don't have the same religious affiliation as us. In doing so, Satan gets us to **blindly hate** people we would otherwise like, and at least tolerate abrasive, pushy, egotistical people who we would otherwise avoid... all based on the totally meaningless name of our religion. It is therefore imperative to know that Satan wants your religious affiliation to be such 'a part of your identity', that you will feel as if you are being 'stripped of your identity' if you do not call yourself by the <u>name</u> Christian, Muslim, Jew, Hindu, etc. These are the seeds of division that Satan plants deep in our psyche in an attempt to keep us from God's plan to Unify all of humanity; of which Jesus addresses in John 17.23 when He asks the Father 'that they may be made perfect in one (with Us)'. Imagine not having to call others by 'the <u>name</u> of some man-made religious institution'. Imagine how humanity would be unified if we Simply did not go by the name (or label) Yew, Catholic, Protestant, Christian, Muslim, Hindu, or Buddhist', because the only name that applies to all is 'human'. As Paul says in Colossians 3.11 and Galatians 3.28 'There is neither Greek nor Jew, male nor female, circumcised <u>nor</u> uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave <u>nor</u> free, for as you are all <u>one</u> in Christ, you are <u>all</u> therefore <u>equal</u>'. We must know that, as our religions (speaking in worldwide terms) are closely tied to <u>race</u>, <u>nationality</u>, and <u>ancestry</u>, God is **not bound** by man-made names that describe race, religion, nationality, or ancestry. And He can place any soul in any 'physical body', regardless of these man-made limitations and name barriers that we have programmed our minds to accept. Would we not accept Jesus if He returned and did not look like 'what we think He should look like', not being affiliated with the <u>names</u> we have come to expect as being 'who Jesus is'? What if Jesus returned and appeared to us as a 'non-Jew black, white, or Asian person', instead of a Jewish Middle Easterner? Think about it. The fact that 'Jesus was a Jew, and the all Jewish Apostles propagated Christ's message after His death, while early Christianity condemned the Jews', should in itself show how 'names of groups' are meaningless and misleading. So we must realize here that, as we are mislead by 'names of groups' and 'our preprogrammed expectations of people of a specific race, religion, nationality, or ancestry', the particular group of Jews responsible for killing Jesus 2000 years ago could just as well be anybody from any race, religion, nationality, or ancestry today. Therefore, we must know that names are utterly deceptive and misleading, and Satan will use names to enslave us to his false gods, thereby turning 'people (affiliated with different false gods) who would otherwise be friends' into enemies. And we must know that God is not bound by our man-made name barriers that describe our race, religion, nationality, or ancestry, but it is rather Satan who institutes and propagates name barriers to keep us senselessly divided and at war; realizing that if Satan's 'name barriers' were to be removed, it would no longer be 'us and them', it would only be 'us'. Thus, as intellectually advanced as we think we are, we will remain Cavemen - senselessly beating each other over the head - if we cannot understand that we have been deceived by names and labels; meaning that there is not, and never has been, an 'us and them', there is only 'us'. And we will remain cavemen if we cannot realize that 'God made all nations of men from One blood' (Acts 17.26). So whether we know it or not, we all already belong to the 'same group' with the 'same name': human.

So what is one of the main reasons why we cannot simply do away with these 'Satan assigned name <u>barriers'</u> which have us blindly (in an <u>unquestioning</u> manner) pledging allegiance to one of his many false gods? Remembering that 'Satan disguises himself as Jesus and/or God', and 'Satan's ministers (our religious leaders) blindly pose as ministers of righteousness', the simple answer is **fear**. Our religious leaders, by association with the name of God, quite simply project the idea that 'to oppose, test, or question them and their false gods, is to oppose, test, and question God Himself'. But this is not true, and we are really being double minded and not true to ourselves if we don't question these men. Think about it. Would you not question and research 'a <u>surgeon</u> and his methods' before you allow him to cut on you? Or would you not question and research 'a doctor and his supposed miracle medication' before taking his potential poison? Of course you would. Yet, because our 'supposed spiritual physicians' have associated themselves seamlessly with God and Jesus - while saying things like 'You need to have a healthy fear of the Lord' (which is really 'the false god they created in their own image') - we allow them, without questioning, testing, or researching their 'spiritual methods and medicines', to 'cut on our spirits' and 'feed us spiritual poison' that is disguised as 'miracle medication'; just as Satan's fruit of false knowledge is disguised as fruit of true knowledge. So we must recognize that, in many other aspects of our lives (particularly our physical health), we would (usually) question, test, and research in order to gain the knowledge needed to identify those who are 'quacks' or 'fakes'. But, in the case of our spiritual health, we remain ignorant of our religious leaders' 'spiritual methods and medicines', not being able to identify them as quacks and fakes, thereby remaining in fear. That is, you can't question or test anything if you don't know the language, and you are therefore at the mercy of those (i.e., our religious leaders) who claim to 'know the language of God'; of course making you fearful of 'them and the false gods created in their own image', as they project the certainty that they have the power to 'cut off' your spiritual connection with God (i.e., excommunication, and consequential disassociation with the *name* of their false god). Hence - considering that <u>our religious leaders don't even understand the</u>

1st page (i.e., 'the story of Adam and Eve') of the Bible, thereby equating them to 'a surgeon who doesn't even know the <u>difference</u> between a <u>scalpel</u> and a <u>butter knife</u>' - our supposed spiritual physicians are 'hacks', 'hacking away at our souls for Satan', while claiming to be 'performing highly skilled procedures for Christ (the Divine Physician) that are essential for our spiritual health'. And, due to our 'fear based on ignorance', we allow these men to continue slowly destroying us from within (week after week at church), even paying them for their 'services', just as people continue to pay so many fraudulent doctors and surgeons who slowly kill people with man-made drugs and false knowledge. Thus, knowing that Satan wants nothing more than for us to fear questioning and testing 'the false gods that he has so cleverly passed off as the one true God' - i.e., Satan wants nothing more than to have people bow their heads in **fear** and **submission** to his false gods, **thinking** that they are 'fearing and submitting to God Himself' - we must do as Paul says in 1 Thessalonians 5.21 and "Test all things"; which will of course lead us to the truth that our religious leaders are in fact fraudulent spiritual physicians (or false prophets), with their religions being 'belief systems of spiritual poison' (or false gods) that keep humanity spiritually sick. And ultimately, if we are ever to regain our 'collective spiritual health', we must **not fear** removing (or 'cutting out'), from our personal identities, the **silly** name barriers which are actually associations with 'Satan and his false gods', not the one true God. If we are ever to **regain** our 'collective spiritual health', we must **not fear** removing (or 'cutting out'), from our personal identities, the silly name barriers which have been, by 'hacking away at our souls', implanted (by our fraudulent spiritual physicians) deep within our subconscious minds, propagating 'an internal stronghold of division and exclusion', which in turn propagates 'external strongholds of division and exclusion'... of course ending in senseless worldwide war and hate.

Therefore, as fraudulent spiritual physicians, our religious leaders (particularly Christian) have acted as though they are 'helping us to find Christ every week', when in actuality they are 'hurting us by making us blind to who Christ really is', **boldly** proclaiming that they can **interpret** His words, thereby SUpposedly 'filling in the gaps' that were unspoken by Christ (i.e., words that Jesus would have said). But the words that they speak are in **direct opposition** to Christ's words, and in most cases, they interpret literally, when Jesus clearly says that He speaks figuratively (in parables). So, as they speak words that directly oppose Christ's words, this of course leads to (just as what happened to Christ Himself) 'the condemnation of innocent individual followers for non-sins' (which are usually sex, drinking, or drug related), while the guilty (religious) leaders, who commit the real, macro sins of 'speaking falsely on behalf of God' (which causes widespread violence, desolation, and enslavement), go free, and are even wrongly exalted as being 'our spiritual helpers' and 'supposed peacemakers'. Hence, we must ultimately recognize that this idea of 'religious leaders thinking that they are helping us and God, while doing the <u>direct opposite</u>, thereby <u>blindly hurting</u> us and God' (which is the essence of the <u>1</u>st page of the Bible with 'the story of Adam and Eve'), is exactly what has been happening for thousands of years. And so, knowing that the same scenario will play out again in this, our own day, one of the most important aspects to take away from 'the story of Christ' is that 'Jesus told supposed men of God, the religious leaders, that **they were evil** because they **taught Satan's laws**, while **blindly** being under

the impression (due to inherited traditions and lies passed down from their forefathers) that they were teaching God's laws; again why Jesus referred to them as 'blind leaders of the blind' (Matthew 15.14). Think about it. These men spent their entire lives believing that 'what they were doing was in service to God'. But it was actually in service to themselves and their man-made institution; which is ultimately Satan. In other words, because the religious leaders 'lusted' after glory - "They love the best places at feasts, the best seats in the synagogues, greetings in the marketplaces, and to be called by men, 'Rabbi, Rabbi'" (Matthew 23.6-7) - they spent their entire lives blind (because of pride, vanity, and envy) to the fact that they served Satan, while thinking that they served God; or, as with Adam and Eve, 'they disobeyed God, while truly believing that they were obeying God'. Thus, when Christ returns, He will again, by the revealing of His true knowledge (i.e., the apocalypse), tell 'supposed men of God', our supposed spiritual physicians, that they are really frauds, 'poisoning us with their false knowledge', while claiming and thinking that 'they are feeding us miracle medication' (just as so many doctors also do).

Now we must consider for a minute that these things (i.e., the honor and glory among men) are the <u>reason Why</u> the Jewish hierarchy, various leaders, and wise men (as opposed to the lower class or uneducated) all found it so a difficult and impossible to 'believe in Christ', as Christ threatened to not only 'make their jobs obsolete', but to expose their ignorance (i.e., figurative nakedness); thereby of course taking away their honor and glory. Imagine if you (as a wise man, elder, Chief Priest, etc.) received a **doctorate** in theology (or <u>any</u> doctorate) and spent your <u>entire life</u> working on something you thought to be a noble cause, only to be told by a 30-year-old 'uneducated' (John 7.15) Carpenter that your doctorate and life's work was all in Vain, actually being the defiled cause of Satan. This is 'what' Jesus told the Jewish wise men, elders, and religious leaders, and this is 'why' they hated Him with <u>passion</u>. Their <u>inflated egos could <u>not</u> believe that this was possible; that Satan could <u>deceive</u> them</u> (just as he did to Adam and Eve) to this magnitude. Hence, it is this scenario that someone in today's world (especially a religious leader or 'government leader depending on the support of a religious leader') must consider when questioning 'whether or not they would have believed in Jesus 2000 years <u>ago</u>'. And so 'to believe in Jesus' means '<u>opposing</u> everything you spent your whole life <u>defending</u>'; i.e., to 'throw away your man-made **PhD**'. 'To believe in Jesus' means 'to admit - just like **Saul** - that the supposed **truth** you received from your forefathers is actually a **lie**'. And so ultimately, 'to believe in Jesus' means 'to leave everything you have ever known' (Luke 5.11); not to just blindly repeat 'I believe in Jesus'. That is, to merely say 'I believe in Jesus' (as if speaking a spiritual spell or practicing sorcery) is meaningless and not the true meaning of 'believing in Jesus'. 'To believe in Jesus' means 'to humbly accept the truth (John 8.32) that the traditions and inherited mindset you have been taught from the time of your childhood is a blatant lie from Satan'. 'To believe in Jesus' means 'to humbly accept that the truth is not the truth'. 'To believe in Jesus' means 'to accept the true Good News that <u>Jesus came to **abolish religion**</u> and all of its sacrifices, ceremonies, and rituals'. 'To believe in Jesus' means that 'we must simply love one another in order to gain eternal life' (John 3.16 & 13.34, and Luke 10.25-28). And so these are all the things someone must 'believe in' to truly 'believe in Jesus'. And to

repeat the words 'I believe in Jesus' in the hope of gaining eternal life - as if speaking a spiritual spell or practicing sorcery - is the mindset of witchcraft and magic, 'honoring Jesus with meaningless words'. Pope Francis recently wrote "Belief means transcending ourselves, leaving behind our comfort and the inflexibility of our eqo in order to center our life in Jesus Christ". Upon Jesus' return, the 'flexibility' of the **Pope's ego**, and the ego of every other religious leader, will be put to the test. Are they truly willing to 'leave everything they have ever known' (i.e., to be 'flexible') in order to (just as the Apostles did) follow the true Savior? Or are they 'honoring Jesus with their words while their hearts are far away' (Matthew 15.8), thereby acting just like their non-believer Scribe and Pharisee predecessors, whose necks were 'rigid and stiff'? So, are our present day religious leaders truly willing to 'lay aside their rigid **egos** and throw away their **man-made doctorates in theology**', thereby coming 'face to face' with the reality of 'Why it was so difficult to believe in Jesus 2000 years ago'? Here we must remember that Satan knows no boundaries. He sadistically preys on a religious leader's deepest desires for acceptance and attention (i.e., honor and glory), disguising himself as God and/or Jesus in order to bestow false honors on them, making them feel wanted and needed. And by doing this, Satan deceives religious leaders into 'speaking falsely on God's behalf', thereby propagating many false personas of God that cause desolation; ultimately meaning that, they spend their entire lifetime unknowingly (or **blindly**) serving **Satan**... all while <u>thinking</u> that they are serving **God**. Thus, to <u>truly</u> 'believe in Jesus' is to be a **lifelong** theologian and religious elder (with a PhD in theology), yet still have the **humility** to simply say 'Satan deceived me' (Genesis 3.13); of course then conceding to true knowledge. In other words, to truly 'believe in Jesus', is to - after being made aware of indisputable evidence that proves your 'supposed knowledge' to be 'false knowledge and man-made nonsense' - humbly put on 'true clothing', not wanting to cover over your nakedness (i.e., ignorance) with fig leaves.

Additionally, people *fixate* and *focus* on mindlessly saying '<u>I believe</u> that Jesus <u>rose from the dead</u>', but we must understand that the resurrection was merely a means of making us believe the words that Jesus said before His death. I.e., the resurrection was the proof that 'what Jesus had been saying for 3 years' was in fact the truth of God, as God is the only One who can raise people from the grave. And so without truly believing in the **knowledge** of Christ - i.e., the **knowledge behind** the death on the cross, and subsequent resurrection - saying over and over again '<u>I believe</u> that Jesus died and rose from the dead' is worthless and meaningless. That is, without knowing the true knowledge of Christ, we don't even know 'what it is' that His resurrection is 'proof of', and we don't even know 'what it is' that we are claiming to wholeheartedly 'believe in'. And so, as we have been taught 'a false persona of Jesus' (that is really 'the persona of Satan'), to say 'I believe in the false Jesus that the Catholic Forefathers created' is just like saying 'I believe in Satan'. Hence, as the world (as a whole) does not know the true knowledge of Christ, saying 'I believe in Jesus' is useless, as we don't know 'what it is' and 'Who it is' that we say we believe in. And furthermore, if we don't know the true knowledge of Christ, then we make His death and resurrection for nothing, believing in things that Jesus never said, and are therefore anti-Christ. So as important as Christ's **death** and **resurrection** were to make us believe 'what He said was the truth' (i.e., the resurrection was the proof), if we don't even know what He said (i.e., His true knowledge), then we **nullify** His death and resurrection; ultimately meaning that it is 'the knowledge behind the death and resurrection' that is of supreme importance. And those who say 'I believe in Christ' or 'I've been washed in the blood of Christ' have no idea what they are saying if they don't understand 'the true knowledge behind the blood'; realizing of course that we are only washed clean by the words (or true knowledge) of Christ (John 15.3), not by making some 'meaningless profession of faith', as if 'casting a normalized spell that has the name of Christ attached to it'.

And so, in <u>summary</u>, Satan accomplishes his main objective of 'tricking humanity into blindly <u>destroying</u> itself' by A) assuming (i.e., stealing) the names and identities of God, Jesus, or any other name of past righteousness (such as the true Prophets), and then **B**) speaking lies from behind those names. By doing this, Satan is able to convince *false prophets* to also, by blatant misinterpretation of Scripture, speak *lies* (many times <u>unknowingly</u>) from <u>behind</u> these names of righteousness (effectively <u>breathing</u> false life into names), thereby creating many different conflicting false versions or false personas of God called 'false gods'; which of course we wholeheartedly 'believe in', thinking that we believe in the one true 'capital G' 'God'. And so we realize that it is these false gods - or 'the man-made doctrine of each of our modern-day <u>religions</u>' - which are actually the 'hidden support system' that perpetuates the unrighteous authority, glory, abuse of power, superiority, and enslavement practices of our *false prophets*; with the <u>trickle-down effect</u> of these things being unrighteous *judgment of the* <u>innocent,</u> and <u>exclusion</u> and <u>dissension</u> toward those <u>not worshiping</u> 'the false gods made in the image of our false prophets'... which of course leads to senseless 'division, war, and hate', and ultimately 'the destruction of humanity'. Hence, while we have been misled by our religious leaders (or false prophets) to believe that Christ focused His attention on 'literal fornicators, adulterers, and harlots', the fact is that He actually focused His attention on 'figurative fornicators, adulterers, and harlots' (i.e., those having spiritual intercourse and intimate relations with 'Satan disguised as God') because these figurative fornicators (i.e., false prophets and various religious leaders) were, and still are, the **idolaters** (see Ephesians 5.5) who, by **coveting** control and **power**, create and perpetuate the false gods that cause much of the 'division, war, and hate' of this world; noting that, by these false prophets and religious leaders misinterpreting this 'sexual language', they essentially 'magnify the unimportant' (i.e., literal drunkenness and intercourse), while 'obscuring the important' (i.e., figurative 'drunkenness on power', and 'intercourse with Satan' that causes widespread desolation). Thus idolatry (i.e., the creation and worship of false gods and false idols) is 'the sin of the world', and so it is <u>idolatry</u> that Jesus came to 'take away', as <u>idolatry</u> is the 'macro level sin of the nations' which leads to widespread violence, oppression, and ultimately the destruction of humanity. And since our religions are 'false gods in disquise', it is the idolatry represented by our religions that Jesus, upon His return, will remove, destroy, and abolish. That is, Jesus came to ultimately destroy religion, not to start a new religion.

For most Christians (in addition to devout followers of other religions), this idea - that 'Jesus came to destroy religion', and that 'the religions of our world are actually false gods that are products of the unspeakable **lies** of our religious forefathers' - may seem like 'believing the unbelievable'. Yet, at the same time, a Christian must realize that, to 'not consider this' presents somewhat of a conflicting mindset. Think about it. A Christian's faith (in today's world) is centered around 'believing the most unbelievable act of a Man being brutally murdered, then coming back to life'. And a devout Christian in today's world says that 'they believe this unbelievable resurrection' Without even seeing and witnessing it in person; it having happened 2000 years ago. Yet, even after seeing and witnessing every day for themselves 'men in leadership positions who will lie for control and power, and do anything to protect (i.e. place fig leaves over) their lies', those same Christians will say that 'It is unbelievable that our religious forefathers (people they <u>never</u> personally knew or saw) would <u>also</u> be *liars'*. In other words, many Christians will <u>double mindedly</u> say that 'they <u>believe</u> in the <u>most unbelievable</u> <u>resurrection</u> of Christ', yet will <u>not</u> '<u>believe</u> the <u>very believable</u> idea' that 'our past religious leaders were <u>liars</u> who <u>lied</u> for their <u>own</u> glory and benefit'. So for most religious people, to believe that 'our <u>religions</u> are actually <u>false gods</u> in disguise' means quite <u>simply conceding</u> to the fact that 'you have been **lied** to by powerful men (i.e., our **religious forefathers** such as **supposed** Catholic Saints) in the **past**'; which is actually a very easily believed idea when you consider that we see and witness this same occurrence **every day** of our own lives, and when **compared** to being asked to 'believe in an unbelievable resurrection that you never saw or witnessed with your own eyes'. Here we must remember that, as Satan has made sure that our religious forefathers (by false association with God, Jesus, the Apostles, etc.) are portrayed as being 'holy, virtuous, and God-like' (when in reality they were 'wicked, covetous, and Satan-like'), we are kept fearful of questioning and testing our religious forefathers; as if to do so is 'to question and test God Himself'. Thus, knowing that 2000 years ago Jesus basically told the entire Jewish hierarchy of religious leaders that 'they were all blindly serving Satan and speaking his lies', to truly 'believe in' and 'be a follower of the true Christ' we must be willing to question and test our religious leaders and forefathers, 'believing the very believable idea' that 'the entire hierarchy of religious leaders (which we were raised to believe are holy, virtuous, and God-like) are <u>actually blind</u> servants of Satan who <u>speak</u> (for their own glory) <u>lies</u> and <u>blasphemy</u> in the names of God and Jesus, and will do <u>anything</u> to <u>protect those lies</u>'; realizing here that, the <u>purpose</u> of this <u>entire text</u> is to make the multitudes 'believers in the true Christ' by disproving the lies of our religious forefathers which have led to the creation of 'many false personas of God' (i.e., many false gods) that go by 'the <u>names</u> of our **religions**'.

Those who control the past, control the future. By 'changing the intentions' of Christ's words and actions, our religious forefathers (particularly Catholic) essentially 'changed everything', grossly misinterpreting 'the few words written about a Man they had never met', thereby breathing new, defiled life into a name, thus changing the entire life, existence, and persona of Jesus into 'a false Jesus' who started a new religion (i.e., Roman Catholicism), of which they (our

religious forefathers) would be the *administrators* and *rulers*, directly opposing Christ's command to be 'servants, not absolute rulers' (Matthew 20.26); making us wonder here, 'How many subsequent rulers' have <u>ruled</u> following **principles** of this **false**, man-made Jesus?' So by 'controlling the <u>past</u>' with blatant misinterpretations (i.e., lies) that granted them unrighteous authority and power - or, by essentially <u>rewriting the past</u> - our religious forefathers, from <u>behind</u> 'a false, fictitious Jesus that <u>never</u> existed', were able to seize control over people's minds and consciences, thereby 'controlling future events' in order to enslave the multitudes to themselves (that is, the false god or religion that 'they made in their own image'); with other religious leaders following suit, creating their own 'false gods (i.e., religions) that <u>resembled themselves</u>'... and <u>not resembling</u> the one <u>true Christ</u> or the one <u>true God</u>. Now this of course means that, for the last 2000 years of having our religious leaders control the past and **rewrite history**, they have **controlled the future**, building a world that **appeared**, on the surface (i.e., in word, not intention), to be centered around Christ (i.e., His true persona), when the whole time it has been <u>centered</u> around their 'false, fictitious persona of Christ', which is **ultimately** themselves (i.e., the false gods made in their own image, realizing that 'the worship of false gods made in the image of man' = 'the worship of man'). Consequently, the world that we know and were born into is not centered on the one true God (or true persona of God), but rather is centered around (or worships) 'the varying personas of our religious forefathers and their modern-day descendants'; which are actually 'varying false personas of God' that we fail to see as being the same renamed false gods that Satan tricked people into creating and worshipping in the Old Testament. Thus, when Jesus returns, 'He will **startle all the nations** and **shut the mouths** of our (both <u>hidden</u> and seen) kings, as they will hear and consider things that they have never heard or considered before' (Isaiah 52.15). When Jesus returns, we will see and understand 'who the real Jesus was and is', and His revelation of knowledge (i.e., the apocalypse) will destroy the lies spoken in His name, thereby destroying the world that has been (by following the lead of our blind kings and blind hidden kings) blindly built around and centered on Satan's false gods (our religions), ultimately creating a NeW WOrld centered around 'the true persona of God' (Revelation 21.1). In other words, when Jesus returns, His revelation of knowledge (i.e., the apocalypse) will 'unearth the dirt (i.e., lies) spoken in His name', thereby exposing the unseen 'source of division, war, and hate' to His brightness, making it and 'its tree' wither and dry up; ultimately meaning that Satan's man-made world (i.e., 'the kingdom of Satan') that gorges itself on 'the fruit of the tree of division, war, and hate' will 'starve and die out' so we may build a **new world** (i.e., 'the kingdom of God') that eats only from 'the Tree of Life', and is consequently centered around true unity, peace, and love.

2. The True New Covenant: Hidden in Plain Sight by the Darkness

The New Covenant, which was sealed with the sacrificial blood of Christ on the cross, was, and still is God's gift to humanity. The New Covenant is God's direct relationship with man that abolishes and nullifies all man-made principalities and institutions (i.e., religions) that stand between God and His people. And so under the New Covenant, God's people, or His 'body of believers in Christ', are free and independent of A) any and all man-made principalities, institutions, churches, temples, religions, etc., B) any and all false teachers, false prophets, and false mediators who run and oversee those establishments, and C) any and all religious rituals, ceremonies, sacraments, assemblies, etc. So above all, the New Covenant represents freedom and liberty from the spiritual and consequential physical oppression and enslavement that is inherent in religious institutions (and the governments which they influence) that portray 'a false persona of God' in the interest of their own authority, glory, and supremacy. Thus, the New Covenant is truly Good News.

Yet while most people have heard of the term 'New Covenant', they actually have no idea of its true definition, and no idea of the freedom and liberty that humanity has rejected for 2000 years, as most religious leaders have used the New Covenant to support their 'institutions of spiritual enslavement', while it is the New Covenant that was designed by God for the abolishment of religious institutions. In other words, as it is obvious with the **propagation** of *religious rituals* and *ceremonies* (i.e., the **Old** <u>Covenant</u>) <u>after</u> Christ's death, our blind religious leaders, and consequently their entire multitude of blind followers, are **oblivious** as to the **true meaning** of the New Covenant and its **abolishment** of these religious 'deeds of the law' (as opposed to 'deeds or works of kindness and mercy', see Section 12); which ultimately enslave and oppress humanity. Note here that this obliviousness is mainly due to Satan fabricating 'new deeds of the law' (i.e., Catholic/Christian sacraments) in the name of Christ so that we have blindly <u>continued</u> practicing 'deeds of the law' for the last 2000 years, thereby blindly continuing in the Old Covenant. That is, Satan took Jesus' words, disguised himself as Jesus, and thereby changed the intentions of Jesus in order to make up 'a <u>new batch</u> of deeds of the law' that went by the new, redefined name of (supposedly Jesus approved) 'sacraments', hence tricking humanity into rejecting the New Covenant for almost 2000 years. Now this means that a Christian must recognize that 'Catholic/Christian sacraments' = 'deeds or works of the law in disquise' before even beginning to comprehend the true New Covenant that is 'hidden in plain sight by the darkness of Satan's sadistic lies'. I.e., 'deeds of the Catholic law, deeds of the Lutheran law, deeds of the **Presbyterian** law, etc.' = 'deeds of the **Jewish** law (as described in the New Testament) that have simply taken on **new form** or **shape** so that they are **disquised** as being **non-deeds**'. Thus we must understand that the leaders of our religious institutions - being 'micro-minded', and not 'macro-minded', 'straining out a gnat, and then swallowing a camel' (Matthew 23.24) - examine the smallest details of every word, in every translation of the Bible, yet miss the entire main idea of the New Covenant; and consequently **obscure** the most important part of the dialogue at the **Last Supper** (see Luke 22.20). And

the main idea of the New Covenant - noting that 'a religious leader administering or overseeing a religious deed of the law' = 'teaching others' about God' - is that 'since men ultimately teach false personas of God that resemble themselves, leading to the well disguised worship of man (i.e. false gods), no man shall teach another about God, as God is our only true Teacher and everyone knows God equally'. So we must realize here that, by the religious leaders (i.e., teachers) overlooking this simple concept, they in fact prove that they are truly blind leaders who walk in the darkness of their own pride and arrogance, thereby not seeing the true New Covenant that is (to them, and consequently their followers) 'hidden in plain sight'.

God's New Covenant is detailed in <u>Jeremiah 31.31-40</u> and <u>Hebrews 8.7-13</u>. And since Jeremiah (600 BC) is a Prophet who, in addition to Christians, both Jews and Muslims <u>also</u> follow, the religions of <u>Judaism</u> and <u>Islam cannot</u> plead that they are <u>ignorant</u> or <u>unaware</u> of the New Covenant's <u>existence</u>.

Additionally, we must recognize that, <u>if</u> we cannot even <u>identify</u> '<u>What the Old Covenant was'</u>, then it is <u>impossible</u> to know '<u>What the New Covenant truly is'</u>. And it is obvious that humanity cannot identify the Old Covenant, as we are <u>still</u>, to this day, unknowingly <u>following</u> the Old Covenant by <u>blindly</u> practicing Satan's '<u>renamed</u> deeds of the law'; thereby of course <u>blindly rejecting</u> the <u>true</u> New Covenant. Hence, it must be noted that, <u>immediately after</u> Hebrews 8.13 (i.e., the abolishment of the 'first' or 'Old Covenant'), <u>Hebrews 9.1-10.22</u> details the 'first covenant', saying how 'religious rituals and ceremonies are <u>not</u> pleasing to God' (Hebrews 10.8), and that 'religious rituals and ceremonies can <u>never</u> take <u>away sins'</u> (Hebrews 10.11). As Hebrews 10.11 says, "Every <u>priest</u> stands <u>ministering</u> daily and <u>offering repeatedly</u> the <u>same sacrifices</u>, which can <u>never</u> take away sins". And so, from <u>Hebrews</u> 8.7-13, the <u>definition</u> of the <u>New Covenant</u> - which <u>abolishes</u> the <u>futile</u> ministering and religious deeds of the Old Covenant that our blind religious leaders (for their own glory) insist on <u>still</u> practicing - is as follows.

"The Lord says 'This is the (New) Covenant that I will make with the people of Israel and Judah (which represents humanity). I will put My laws in their minds and write them on their hearts. I will be their God and they will be My people. None of them shall teach their friends or tell their neighbors, saying, 'Know the Lord' (i.e., a direct relationship between God and man), for all shall know Me, from the least of them to the greatest of them. I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and lawless deeds I will remember no more.' In that God says 'A New Covenant', He has made the first (or Old Covenant based on performing religious deeds for forgiveness and salvation) Obsolete and ready to vanish away."

First off it must be clarified that the <u>main problem</u> with the Old Covenant, and the <u>reason</u> for its abolishment is that, by the multitudes <u>practicing religious deeds</u>, our religious leaders are placed in '<u>a</u> <u>perceived position of spiritual supremacy and authority</u>' by which they are tricked by Satan (<u>thinking</u> they are God-like, just like Adam and Eve) into <u>teaching error in the name of God</u>, with this <u>error</u>

(i.e., the <u>redefining</u> of good and <u>evil</u> based on gross biblical misinterpretation) of course leading to *'false personas of God'*; or *'the creation of false gods'* that go by the name 'capital G' 'God'. This is reiterated by the following equation.

$\frac{practicing \ religious \ deeds}{creation \ of \ false \ gods} = \frac{the \ teaching \ of \ error \ in \ the \ name \ of \ God}{creation \ of \ false \ gods}$

Hence, it is of **supreme** importance to understand, in terms of **recognizing** 'why the true New Covenant was <u>even instituted at all</u>', that 'the <u>practicing</u> of Old Covenant <u>religious deeds</u> (i.e., all of the religious deeds that we <u>still</u> blindly practice today) <u>leads to</u> the <u>teaching</u> of <u>error</u> in the name of God, by which men <u>blindly create false gods</u> made in their own image'. And this is the <u>reason Why</u> the New Covenant articulates that 'No one shall <u>teach</u> another about God' then <u>immediately states</u> that 'The <u>New Covenant abolishes</u> (i.e., 'makes obsolete') the <u>Old Covenant religious deeds</u>'; as the practicing of these religious deeds <u>always</u> comes with <u>fallible commentary</u> on 'who God is' from the (of course spiritually blind) **priest** or **minister**.

Now by the **New Covenant** <u>abolishing</u> the <u>Old Covenant</u>, this means that the <u>priests</u> and <u>ministers</u> (or any modern day religious leader equivalent) who perform 'the religious deeds of the Old Covenant' are <u>removed</u> from their 'perceived positions of spiritual supremacy and authority', and are essentially '<u>out of a job'</u>; which again is the <u>reason why</u> they <u>hated Jesus with passion</u>, and have <u>rejected</u> the <u>true</u> New Covenant for more than 2000 years. Think about it. What else, besides being told that '<u>your entire position</u> in this man-made world is <u>now obsolete</u> and being done away with', would <u>drive</u> an <u>entire hierarchy</u> of religious leaders to <u>condemn</u> and <u>kill Someone</u> who did such good things? Would powerful men of <u>any corporation</u> (knowing that our <u>religions</u> are <u>simply corporations</u> as well) in today's world not want to kill someone who <u>threatened</u> their <u>entire</u> <u>business</u> and <u>way of life</u>? Thus it is imperative to understand that, from the time of Jesus' 1st coming until today, the religious leaders of this world have <u>rejected</u> 'the <u>true</u> Jesus and the <u>true</u> New Covenant', as They stand for the <u>removal</u> of the idea that 'religious deeds are <u>necessary</u> for salvation', thereby <u>also</u> standing for the <u>removal</u> and <u>elimination</u> of <u>the entire position</u> and <u>way of life</u> of religious leaders who perform these religious deeds.

Therefore, the New Covenant, in order to eliminate 'the <u>blind error taught</u> by our religious leaders through the performing of religious deeds', mandates the <u>removal</u> of <u>all false intercessors</u> or <u>false mediators</u> (that we recognize as 'religious leaders') who are <u>perceived</u> as being 'necessary mediums between the <u>physical</u> and <u>spiritual realms'</u>, thereby establishing <u>a direct relationship</u> between <u>God and man, with Christ</u> as the <u>sole Mediator</u> (Hebrews 9.15 and 1 Timothy 2.5). Note here that 'sole Mediator' means 'the <u>One</u> who <u>speaks</u> or <u>transmits</u> God's <u>true</u> intentions, conveying God's true persona (which eliminates false gods), thereby bringing <u>resolution</u> between God and

humanity', as humanity is unknowingly opposed to God's true persona, and consequently His will. So now that A) there is only one Mediator (recognizing here that 'there are NO mediators to the Mediator', as our religious leaders claim to be), and B) Hebrews 10.8&11 says that 'Outward rituals, ceremonies, burnt offerings, and sacrifices <u>repeatedly</u> offered by **priests** and **ministers** are <u>not wanted</u> by God, as they can never take away (inward) sins', the New Covenant therefore places every human being on an **equal** plane, and thus <u>eliminates</u> the religious leaders' 'perceived authority from God' and 'perceived necessary position in the chain of salvation' by which they blindly teach the error (i.e., the redefinition of good and evil) that leads to 'the creation of false gods', leading ultimately to senseless 'division, war, and hate'. And they of course make themselves 'necessary' by essentially saying, whether spoken or unspoken, 'I have a better relationship or rapport with God, therefore you need me and my prayers, rituals, and sacrifices (i.e., well disquised witchcraft, sorcery, and spells) for the forgiveness of sins and salvation, among other (supposed) blessings'. I.e., as false mediators they say 'You <u>need me</u> to <u>teach</u> you about God, and you need me to <u>contact God</u> for you'. To further clarify, with the **Old** (or first) **Covenant**, the Jewish priests were thought (as Jeremiah 7.22 says 'God never wanted burnt offerings and sacrifices') to be necessary mediators or intercessors to perform animal sacrifices and offerings for the forgiveness of sins, while with the New Covenant, Jesus was offered as 'the final Sacrifice' (Hebrews 10.12) in order to solidify and make known the idea that 'our sins are forgiven **directly** by God as we forgive others' (Matthew 6.12); not 'as we perform animal or human sacrifices, or any other religious deed'. In other words, **by** Jesus' death and resurrection (the sealing of the New Covenant) we are to therefore **believe** that 'the New Covenant is in fact the abolishment of religion (i.e., sacrifices and rituals) which is **truly mandated by God**. Again, this removes the religious leaders (who usually conduct sacrifices) and their religious institutions from the chain of salvation, and consequently <u>removes their *perceived spiritual supremacy* and *authority* over others; which they use,</u> as *false mediators*, to <u>teach</u> people to follow 'the false gods made in their own image', with humanity then **blindly** fighting and killing each other to protect these false gods... of course saying 'My god is better than your god'. Thus the true Good News of the true New Covenant that A) 'frees us from <u>dependency</u> on <u>false mediators</u> for salvation', and <u>B)</u> 'brings about <u>world peace</u> by destroying all of Satan's false gods that are (through religious deeds) <u>taught</u> by these false mediators' is that '<u>God only</u> wants kindness, mercy, justice, and humility, <u>not</u> sacrifices, ceremonies, rituals, or any other religious deed or offering' (Matthew 9.13, Micah 6.6-8, and Isaiah 1.11-17), with the New Covenant abolishing 'the Old (or first) Covenant idea' that 'sacrifices and religion <u>are</u> wanted by God for the forgiveness of sin and salvation'; as it is rather quite the **opposite**, with God not wanting sacrifices and religion because they are the hidden (by the name of God) 'root cause of sin', and actually defile 'the true worship of God' (i.e., simply 'loving others as yourself') by creating the **macro level** religious **supremacy** and <u>exclusion</u> of 'no salvation or forgiveness <u>outside</u> of a particular religion' and 'no salvation or forgiveness without religious leaders (i.e., false mediators)'... which ultimately Causes 'division, war, and hate' (i.e., the total opposite of 'loving others as yourself'). Note here that this religious supremacy and exclusion is referred to as 'boasting' in Ephesians 2.9, or 'leaven', which is being 'puffed up with pride',

in Matthew 16.6. Hence, the true Good News of the true New Covenant is simply 'the end of

<u>religion</u>'; noting that many 'non-denominational' or 'other' religions practice 'religion that they say is <u>not</u> religion', <u>redefining</u> 'their <u>violations</u> of the New Covenant' as '<u>compliance</u> with, and the <u>upholding</u> of the New Covenant'. As Jesus says, concerning the <u>New Covenant</u> (i.e., 'the <u>end</u> of <u>religion</u>' and 'what we should do to receive eternal life'), 'The hour is coming (i.e., the End of the Age, and the destruction of all temples), and is actually already in effect, when you will <u>not</u> worship God by performing <u>sacrifices</u>, religious deeds, or worship services in man-made temples' (John 4.21), 'For the <u>only thing</u> God requires for <u>salvation</u> is that <u>you love your neighbor as yourself</u>' (Luke 10.25-28), as this is this <u>essence</u> of being 'one united <u>body of people</u> that feels the pain of others as if being <u>your own pain</u>'; noting that this '<u>body</u> of people' is discussed later in Section 2.

In terms of the idea that we have <u>continued in</u>, and <u>never left</u> 'the <u>mentality</u> <u>behind</u> the Old Covenant', it is important to recognize the way we have been taught to view Jesus as being 'the final Sacrifice'. We must remember that the Jews of Jesus' day were quite familiar with the (erroneous) idea of 'performing daily animal sacrifices and other such religious deeds in order for God to forgive the people's sins'; and so Jesus was simply being called 'the final Sacrifice' in order to draw a parallel with 'what the Jews had been doing for many years'. But, one of the most important aspects with identifying the real underlying problem of the Old Covenant is based on the common sense, logical idea that cutting up and cooking an animal, pouring water on yourself, saying special prayers (i.e., spiritual spells), etc. has **absolutely nothing to do with** God being **satisfied**, and therefore **forgetting** about our sins'. Here we must use our God-given common sense and logic (something Satan wants you to forget about) and put ourselves in God's place. Noting that we are made in God's image, and we can parallel 'God's relationship with His people' to 'a father's relationship to his children', think how you (being 'the father') would react to a child who continually (on a daily basis) hurt your other children, giving them black eyes and bloody noses, yet every day, in order to 'make up for these things', would A) wash himself (i.e., go swimming) in a pool of water, **B)** monotonously **chant** your name over and over again, saying 'how great and wonderful you are', **C**) tell you '<u>I'm sorry, I'm sorry, I'm sorry</u>', and **D**) cook a <u>steak</u> on the **barbeque** (i.e., 'a burnt animal sacrifice') and then proceed to eat the steak '<u>in your</u> honor' (noting that God also never got to actually eat any of the Jew's animal sacrifices and burnt offerings). And now imagine if this child continued doing this for 1000 years or more. You would of course say to that child, 'I don't care how many times you go swimming, chant my name, say 'I'm sorry', or eat steaks in my honor, that has absolutely nothing to do with you hurting the other children, or making me forget that you hurt them, as the other children still come to me every day with black eyes and bloody noses'. And you would also say 'All I want is for you to be nice to the other children'. So if our 'pea brain, finite, caveman minds' can understand something so simple, then we are truly insulting God's intelligence to think that 'performing any religious deed has anything to do with forgiveness and salvation'. Therefore, in terms of Jesus being 'the final Sacrifice', we must come to the logical, God-given, common sense conclusion that the term 'final Sacrifice' was being used Only to

draw a parallel to this Old Covenant erroneous mentality that 'God was somehow satisfied with a blood offering, or blood being shed'. In other words - remembering again that 'Satan keeps his lies close to the truth' - if we believe the (wrong) conventional idea that 'God was somehow satisfied with Jesus' blood being shed, and <u>forgives</u> our sins based off of us **simply** <u>**Citing**</u> the final Sacrifice, saying **'I believe in** the final Sacrifice' (which is another <u>disquised</u> religious deed of worthless words)', then we must realize that we are **still blindly trapped** in the warped mindset of the **Old Covenant**, and we have ignorantly placed Jesus on the same line as being some sort of 'super elevated, glorified animal sacrifice' that is to satisfy God for all time, in terms of our sins; provided we say the spiritual spell 1 believe in Jesus' 3 times, which again is simply a worthless religious deed that 'honors God with words'. We must think here, does it really make any sense at all for us to be forgiven and receive salvation just based on saying 'I believe that Jesus died for my sins', especially when many are just programmed to say this as a child? Also we must think that, just as your intelligence as a father would be insulted if your sinning child thought that he could 'eat a steak in your honor and say some magic words' then be forgiven, we insult God's intelligence, and actually nullify Jesus' sacrifice and the New Covenant, by treating Jesus as if He was 'a glorified animal sacrifice that keeps God from becoming angry about our sins'... provided of course that we say the magic words 'I believe in the final Sacrifice'. So Jesus was 'the final Sacrifice' because He made known and solidified the New Covenant idea (i.e., knowledge) that 'God is not satisfied with sacrifices, but rather kindness and mercy', thereby putting an end (hence 'the final Sacrifice') to 'sacrifices for the forgiveness of sin'. And this also means that, if God does not even want sacrifices and the shedding of blood, then it is contradictory and wrong to believe that 'God <u>actually wanted</u> the shedding of Christ's blood'; <u>as if</u> being like 'an Old Testament, **ravenous** and **bloodthirsty** false god (i.e., Satan)'. Rather God painfully allowed the shedding of Christ's blood to A) show humanity that He would do anything to have the truth be told in order to save as many people as possible, B) show humanity that, by Christ rising from the dead, we could be assured that 'what Christ said was indeed the <u>truth</u>', and <u>C</u>) show humanity that <u>they</u> are ultimately 'the ones who are ravenous and bloodthirsty', willing to brutally kill the Son of God in order to protect their pride, egos, and of course their *man-made institutions of normalized slavery* (normalized by the name of God). Thus, remembering that 'Satan's lies stand side-by-side with the truth', we must come to the ultimate conclusion that <u>Jesus was sacrificed</u> and <u>raised from the dead</u> to make us believe that '<u>sacrifices</u> have absolutely **nothing** to do with God forgiving sins', as 'we are forgiven when we forgive others'. And we COntradict and oppose everything the New Covenant stands for (continuing in the warped mindset of the Old Covenant) by believing Satan's Crafty lie that 'God forgives people's sins based on Jesus essentially being the greatest animal sacrifice there ever was'. Again, Jesus was sacrificed to seal the New Covenant idea (or knowledge) that 'sacrifices are futile in terms of forgiveness', and we have made Jesus' sacrifice futile by believing that 'His death and shedding of blood on the cross was **all** that God requires (making God out to be a pagan, bloodthirsty god) <u>for our</u> salvation', not understanding that His final sacrifice was to 'end this Old Covenant idea', and make known the **New Covenant** knowledge that 'God's only requirement for forgiveness and salvation

is to love your neighbor as yourself'. If we believe and practice this, then we (regardless of whether we say it or not) truly 'believe in Jesus', and truly believe in the true New Covenant that Jesus was sacrificed for. Note also here that, there is no remission of sin without the shedding of Christ's blood, but we must realize that 'it is the New Covenant truth and knowledge concerning God's true persona (i.e., His likes and dislikes) that was made known through Christ's sacrifice (i.e., this is what Christ 'died for') that brings about the remission (or receding) of macro level sinfulness' - as Isaiah 53.11 says "By Jesus' knowledge, He shall justify many" - not the treating of Christ's sacrifice as if it were 'a super elevated, glorified Old Covenant animal sacrifice' that acts as a 'get out of hell free pass'. And this is why 'God does not want sacrifices and religious deeds, but rather kindness, mercy, and the knowledge of God's true persona' (Hosea 6.6).

Examine the following quotes that support the **true Good News** of the **true New Covenant**. That is, the following quotes support:

- <u>A)</u> The <u>abolishment</u> of 'Old Covenant' <u>religious deeds</u> (i.e., sacrifices, ceremonies, rituals, repetitive prayers services, or any other of 'Satan's modern-day redefined deeds of religious <u>law</u>' that are <u>disguised</u> as 'non-deeds', such as 'Catholic/Christian <u>sacraments</u>' and 'Islamic prayers to Mecca').
- **<u>B</u>)** The subsequent 'removal from office and authority' of the false mediators who perform these religious deeds.
- <u>C</u>) The reiteration of '<u>what</u> God <u>does</u> want for salvation' (i.e., kindness, mercy, justice, and humility, which ultimately <u>translates</u> to simply 'loving your neighbor as yourself').

Additionally, as we read these quotes, we must think that it would make absolutely <u>no sense</u> and be <u>totally contradictory</u> to believe that 'God had Jesus die for a New Covenant that <u>abolishes religion</u> and <u>religious deeds</u>', while <u>simultaneously believing</u> that 'Jesus <u>began</u> a <u>new religion</u> (i.e., Catholicism) and started a <u>new set</u> of religious deeds'. So we must know that any of the religious deeds that we practice today <u>oppose</u> the very <u>essence</u> of Christ's teaching and the New Covenant, and are a product of believing the <u>double minded error taught</u> by our religious leaders; which has of course <u>originated</u> from the <u>cunningly</u> deceptive 'double mind of Satan'. Therefore, the following quotes show that the <u>New Covenant</u> = 'the <u>abolishment</u> of religion and religious deeds, with God <u>only</u> requiring us to love others as ourselves'; with these quotes making us realize (<u>if</u> we can understand that 'our <u>modern day</u> religious deeds' are <u>really</u> 'Satan's deeds of the law <u>in disguise</u>') that we have in fact <u>blindly continued in</u> the Old Covenant, thereby <u>rejecting</u> the <u>true</u> New Covenant and rejecting the <u>true</u> Christ, 'trampling the Son of God underfoot' (Hebrews 10.29).

1. <u>Matthew 15.8&9, Matthew 9.13, Matthew 12.7, and Hosea 6.6</u>: 'These people <u>honor</u> and <u>worship</u> Me (God) <u>in vain</u> with <u>worthless words and rituals</u>, yet their <u>hearts</u> are <u>far away</u> from Me. I (God) desire <u>kindness and mercy</u>, <u>not</u> worthless <u>words</u>, <u>sacrifices</u>, and <u>rituals</u>.'

- 2. Galatians 2.16 and 5.4&14: 'Man does not receive salvation by performing works of the law (i.e., circumcision, sacrifices, and rituals). For by works of the law (which again is not the same as 'good works' or 'works of kindness and mercy' as discussed in Section 12) no man or woman is put right with God. And those who attempt to be justified by performing works of the law are actually estranged from everything that Christ stood for, as works of the law promote supremacy and exclusion. Hence the entire law of God is the fulfilled by simply loving your neighbor as yourself.' Note here that Section 12 makes the distinction between 'works of any religious law' and 'works of kindness and mercy' (i.e., good works), and that performing 'works of a religious law' may impede your salvation by causing supremacy and exclusion, while performing 'works of kindness and mercy' is what is essential for salvation. As Jesus says on the last page of the Bible, 'I am returning to reward everyone according to his work' (Revelation 22.12); which nullifies the Protestant nonsense assertion that 'salvation is not based on good works'.
- 3. <u>Micah 6.6-8</u>: 'God does <u>not</u> want burnt offerings, thousands of rams, 10,000 rivers of oil, or your firstborn child, but rather God **only** requires <u>iustice</u>, <u>mercy</u>, and <u>humility</u>.'
- 4. <u>Jeremiah 7.22-23</u>: 'I (God) did <u>not</u> command your forefathers when I brought them out of Egypt to perform <u>burnt offerings</u> and <u>sacrifices</u>, but rather I commanded them to simply <u>obey My voice</u> (i.e., God's true laws <u>written on our hearts</u>).'
- 5. <u>Psalm 40.6-9</u>: 'Sacrifices, burnt offerings, and sin offerings You (God) <u>do not desire or require</u>, as I (David) delight to do Your will, according to <u>Your law</u> which is <u>written on my heart</u>. And I have proclaimed this **Good News** of righteousness in the <u>great assembly</u>.'
- 6. <u>Isaiah 1.11-17</u>: 'I (God) have had <u>enough</u> of your <u>burnt offerings</u> and <u>sacrifices</u>, and <u>My soul</u> <u>hates</u> when you <u>assemble</u> on <u>Sabbaths</u> and <u>New Moons</u> (as it causes a <u>blind mob mentality</u>).

 Even though you make <u>many prayers</u>, I will <u>not hear them</u> (as they are worthless words). Hence you should learn to <u>do good</u>, <u>seek justice</u>, and <u>rebuke the oppressor</u>.'
- 7. <u>Amos 5.21-24</u>: 'I (God) <u>hate</u> and <u>despise</u> your feast days and <u>sacred assemblies</u> (i.e., the assembling of <u>blind mobs</u>). Though you make burnt offerings, grain offerings, and peace offerings, I will <u>not accept them</u>. Take away from Me the <u>noise</u> of your songs, for I will not hear the melody of your stringed instruments. But let <u>justice</u> and <u>righteousness</u> run like a mighty stream of water.'
- 8. <u>John 4.21</u> and <u>Luke 10.25-28</u> (which reiterates 'what' <u>Jesus</u> says that '<u>God wants</u> for <u>eternal</u> <u>life</u>'): 'Believe Me (Jesus), the hour is coming, and is actually already in effect, when <u>you will NOt</u> <u>perform sacrifices and rituals</u> on Mount Gerizim or in the <u>temple</u> in Jerusalem anymore. For <u>the</u> <u>Only thing God requires for eternal life</u> is that <u>you love your neighbor as yourself</u>.'

And so, by these quotes, it becomes obvious that <u>religion</u> and all of our various 'deeds of religious law' (i.e., sacrifices, ceremonies, rituals, circumcisions, assemblies, and sacraments) have been fabricated by men (i.e., 'religion is man-made'), and God has never wanted us to perform religious deeds; hence the abolishment of the Old Covenant. This essentially means that religion (keeping in mind that they are beautifully disguised *false gods*) is all a **myth**, 'a *false projection in our minds* (placed there by Satan) of God's true expectations', and 'a figment of our imaginations'... that is, our religious forefathers' imaginations. In other words, 'there is no such thing as religion'; which sums up the <u>essence</u> of the New Covenant '<u>in one breath</u>'. To reiterate, the <u>true</u> Good News of the <u>true</u> New Covenant is that 'there is no such thing as religion', just like 'there is no such thing as Santa **Claus**, the **Easter Bunny**, etc.' The only problem is that **humanity** is essentially comprised of '20 to 100-year-old children' who are finding out for the first time that (just like Santa Claus and the Easter Bunny) 'there is no such thing as religion'. If this is hard to believe, then imagine how people (i.e., adults, 20 to 100 years old) felt when they, after believing things to the contrary their entire life, were told things like A) 'The earth is round, not flat', B) 'The earth revolves around the sun; the sun does **not** revolve around the earth', and **C**) 'Our galaxy (the **Milky Way**) is **not** the **universe**, it is **only one** of possibly **hundreds of billions of galaxies** in the universe'. So as recently as the **1920's** we **limited** the universe to <u>one</u> galaxy, when it is possible that there is a <u>limitless</u> and <u>infinite</u> number of galaxies in the universe. Think about it. This means that, as little as 100 years ago we limited God's capabilities to just one galaxy, only to find out how incredibly wrong we were about our perceptions, and 'what we thought was truth'. Knowing this, are we not being stiff-necked and proud to not even consider that 'what we thought was the truth' (i.e., that 'religion is God-made') and 'our perception of God' (remembering that Jesus, 'the express image of God', did not match many people's perception of God) could also possibly be incredibly wrong, and even completely opposite of what we thought? So we must know that, just as the universe is (possibly) limitless and infinite, God is also (definitely) 'a limitless and infinite God', and by not even conceding to the possibility (even when shown all of the proof in this text) that 'there is no such thing as religion', we may as well be trapped in the Dark Ages saying 'It's impossible that the earth is round', remaining proudly and arrogantly limited to the finite knowledge that has been taught to us by 'the <u>limited minds</u> of our religious leaders'. So again, 'there is no such thing as **religion**' in regard to 'sacrifices, rituals, and ceremonies that God **supposedly mandated** as being necessary for salvation'. Rather religious sacrifices have been created and mandated by men as 'a means of **enslaving** other men'. I.e., religion is all a 'myth' which has been fabricated by 'men pompously speaking lies in the name of God', with the motive of attaining control, power, authority, glory, and supremacy by making people 'bow to them and their will' as if 'bowing to God and His will'. And so 'what we thought was bringing us <u>closer</u> to God (i.e., religion and religious deeds)' has actually separated us from God, making us blindly worship man (and ultimately Satan); again why 'taking God's name in vain' is the most serious of offenses. 'What we thought was our key to salvation (i.e., religion and religious deeds)' was really a 'cleverly disguised plot of Satan' to trick us into blindly following him to hell. Now this means that, as much as we have associated the term 'religion' (i.e., sacrifices,

ceremonies, rituals, circumcisions, assemblies, sacraments, etc.) with God, as if they are synonymous with one another, the fact is that they are **antonyms**, being directly **opposed** to one another. Note here that we have done the same with the terms 'religion' and 'faith', using them almost interchangeably, thereby implying that 'those who have no religion also have no faith or belief in God', which is not true at all; remembering that many non-religious Gentiles had more faith than devoutly religious Jews, which ultimately means that 'religion has nothing to do with faith (or spirituality)'. Thus, the true New Covenant - which has been hidden from our minds (just as in 2 Corinthians 3.14&15) for thousands of years by Satan's darkness - details 'an end to man-made religious sacrifices, ceremonies, rituals, circumcisions, assemblies, sacraments, etc.' (including the false mediators who perform them), as these things, being completely fabricated by men in the interest of obtaining earthly control and power, produce 'supremacy and exclusion leading to division, war, and hate'; which of course is the complete antithesis of 'a God who ONLY Wants kindness, mercy, justice, and humility'. And so to reiterate, God - as outlined by the true New Covenant - Only wants us to 'love others as ourselves' to receive eternal life, with religion and religious deeds actually impeding this 'true worship of God' by creating in our minds the supremacy and exclusion (i.e., 'boasting' in Ephesians 2.9, or 'leaven' in Matthew 16.6) of 'no salvation (i.e., no spiritual cleanliness, no respect, no prosperity, etc.) outside of each person's respective religion', which, after causing widespread 'division, war, and, hate', eventually leads to the **blind** self destruction of humanity.

So now we can essentially recognize that:

'the perceived spiritual **supremacy** of our religious leaders'

gives rise to

'the <u>teaching</u> of <u>error</u> (**via** <u>religious deeds</u>) in the name of God' gives rise to

'the creation of many <u>false gods</u> (i.e., religions) that go by the name 'capital G' 'God'' gives rise to

'the <u>macro level **Supremacy**</u> of religious <u>mobs</u> who think that their god is <u>better than</u> the next god' gives rise to

'macro level division, war, and hate'.

And recalling from Section 1 that 'idolatry = supremacy', we can easily see that Supremacy, whether speaking in terms of 'one leader' (think here of Hitler) or 'the trickle-down supremacy that seeps into the minds of an entire nation of people', is the root cause of 'division, war, and hate'. Hence we must understand that, the supremacist mindset of our religious leaders, which is then passed On to their followers - in the interest of assuring allegiance to 'the false god made in a religious leader's, or any leader's image' (such as the 'false god' Nazism being made in Hitler's image) - makes equality, and consequently freedom and peace, impossible. And so because of this supremacist mindset, we must recognize what is essentially an 'equality clause' in the New Covenant; which

is paramount in attaining true freedom and true world peace. Note here that God's equality clause is the <u>precursor</u> to the Declaration of Independence's <u>equality clause</u>: "<u>All men are created</u> equal and are endowed by their <u>Creator</u> with certain unalienable rights (such as) <u>life</u>, <u>liberty</u>, and the pursuit of <u>happiness</u>." And so similarly, the <u>equality clause</u> in the <u>New Covenant</u> states that 'Everyone from the **least** (i.e., fishermen, carpenters, prostitutes, and tax collectors) to the **greatest** (i.e., Popes, bishops, swamis, rabbis, and imams) shall **all** know God **equally** and the **same**'; noting that this is humanity's (not God's) definition of 'who is the <u>least</u> and who is the <u>greatest</u>'. Additionally, this universal equality of the New Covenant is 'written on our hearts and minds'; or as the Declaration of Independence states, 'our universal equality is self-evident'. Therefore, there is 'no man-made certificate of priestly ordination' from any religious institution that can supersede the universal equality of the **New Covenant**. But that is exactly what religious leaders have done for thousands of years, saying, as pompous false mediators, 'We know God better than you, hence, being your necessary divine connection, you must bow to our (disquised as God's) wishes'; which of course are the seeds of their 'hidden caste system of supremacy'. And so by arrogantly ignoring and rejecting the true meaning of the New Covenant - i.e., 'no man shall teach another about God because we all know God equally' religious leaders have, by blindly teaching Satan's laws as being God's laws, kept the true New **Covenant hidden** in *plain sight*, replacing it with a **defiled version** (i.e., 'Satan's varying **false**' covenants', which vary by religion) that keeps them, and consequently Satan, in a supreme position to us, essentially <u>nullifying</u> the <u>equality</u> of the *true* New Covenant, and of course making *true* freedom and true world peace impossible. Thus we should ultimately recognize that the equality of the New Covenant represents the <u>abolishment</u> of 'a hidden caste system' that places the religious leaders in 'a position (at the **top** of the caste system) of **false authority** and **false supremacy**' based solely on their unrighteous association with the name of God. I.e., the New Covenant does away with the religious <u>leader's</u> (and their blind <u>follower's</u>) 'caste system of <u>supremacy</u>' that <u>hides behind</u> 'the <u>name</u> of the God of equality'. As Paul says in Galatians 3.28, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, <u>male</u> nor <u>female</u>; for you are all <u>one</u> (and <u>equal</u>) in Christ Jesus". In other words 'There is <u>**no**</u> Catholic, Jew, Muslim, Christian, Protestant, Buddhist, Hindu, priest, preacher, imam, etc., as we are <u>all **equal**</u> members of the **body** of Christ's people', and 'all made from one blood' (see Acts 17.26). And so, as these religious names are all 'meaningless man-made names which are associations with mere figments and fabrications of our religious forefathers' imaginations', we must come to the final conclusion that, through <u>association</u> with these *religious names* and *labels*, we have been <u>tricked</u> into having a <u>supreme</u> and exclusionary mindset that has led to senseless 'division, war, and hate', thereby overlooking the **simple equality** of the New Covenant, and overlooking the **simple** idea that 'the **only name** that does matter is **human**', as we are all 'born equally of water as humans' (see Section 13).

Essentially, God designed and instituted the New Covenant (which, in itself, is *synonymous* with 'equality' itself) in order to abolish the 'supremacy and consequential enslavement to man' (i.e., both physical and spiritual caste systems) that is ultimately responsible for widespread 'division, war, and hate'. So it is important to understand that, in order to abolish this 'supremacy and enslavement' (and

consequential 'division, war, and hate') - which is a product of 'the <u>lies</u> spoken or <u>taught</u> by <u>false</u> <u>mediators</u> in the name of God' - the New Covenant specifies (i.e., '<u>no one shall teach their friend or neighbor</u> about God, for all shall know, or <u>be taught by God'</u>) that <u>God alone</u> (and of course Christ, the <u>sole Mediator</u> of the New Covenant) <u>will teach His people</u>; which again removes the <u>perceived spiritual supremacy</u> of religious leaders to put everyone on an <u>equal plane</u>, in terms of people's <u>ability</u> to communicate with God. Examine the following quotes that reiterate that <u>God</u> and <u>Christ</u> are our <u>only true Teachers</u>, remembering here that <u>Satan disguises</u> his <u>voice</u> as 'the <u>voice</u> of God and/or Christ' to try and <u>trick</u> us, even '<u>whispering to our minds'</u> as if he is the Holy Spirit; realizing that Satan surely knows <u>1 Kings 19.11&12</u> where 'God does <u>not</u> speak to Elijah as a strong wind, an earthquake, or a fire, but as a <u>small voice</u> or a <u>whisper'</u>.

<u>A)</u> Jesus says in <u>John 6.45</u>, "The Prophets (i.e., Isaiah 54.13 speaking <u>about</u> the <u>New Covenant</u>) wrote, '<u>Everyone</u> will be <u>taught by God</u>'. Anyone who hears the Father and <u>learns from Him</u> comes to Me." Notice here that <u>Jesus **did not** say</u> 'Everyone will be <u>taught</u> by My Apostles, or <u>any</u> man (i.e., <u>false mediator</u>) or man-made principality'.

B) Jesus says in <u>Matthew 23.8</u>, "For <u>One</u> is your <u>Teacher</u>, the <u>Christ</u>". Notice again that <u>even</u> the **Apostles** are '<u>not our teachers</u>'.

C) 1 John 2.26-27 says "I am writing this to you about those who are trying to deceive you. You do not need anyone to teach you (including John himself), as the anointing (of the Holy Spirit) teaches you concerning all things."

<u>D</u>) Jesus says in <u>John 14.26</u>, "The <u>Holy Spirit</u>, whom the Father will send <u>in My name</u>, <u>He will</u> <u>teach you all things</u>"; again noting that Jesus (saying this <u>just before</u> being put to death) does <u>not</u> say 'God will send <u>men in My name</u> to <u>teach</u> you all things'.

So now we must think that, if the **New Covenant** itself (i.e., Hebrews 8.11 and Jeremiah 31.34), **Jesus**, **Isaiah**, and **John** all state that 'God's Spirit will teach you', then WhO are all these other <u>false teachers</u> and <u>false mediators</u> who stand between us and God? Who are all these religious leaders who arrogantly and pompously insist that 'you <u>need</u> them to teach you' and 'you <u>need</u> them for salvation'? Remember from Section 1 that a <u>true teacher</u> says 'You <u>don't need</u> me' while a <u>false teacher</u> says (whether **spoken** or **unspoken**) 'You <u>need</u> me' and 'You are <u>dependent</u> on me for salvation'; of course meaning that a false teacher, <u>enslaving</u> the <u>minds</u> and <u>consciences</u> of the multitudes <u>to himself</u>, teaches people that 'You <u>need me to teach you</u>'. And so we must realize that, according to the New Covenant, it is <u>unlawful</u> before God for <u>religious leaders</u>, <u>friends</u>, <u>neighbors</u>, or any man or man-made principality to <u>teach</u> us about God, as 'teaching people your <u>version</u> of God' = 'teaching people a <u>false persona</u> of God'. In other words, 'teaching your friend or neighbor about God' is like 'man teaching man to be more like man' instead of 'God teaching man to be more like God'. In fact, the entire premise of the <u>New Covenant</u> is that 'anyone who **does teach** their friend or neighbor about God is in **violation** of God's contract or covenant with humanity'; once again because anyone who 'teaches their

friend or neighbor their version of God' is actually 'teaching their friend or neighbor a false persona of God', which translates to 'blindly teaching people to blindly follow false gods, thereby blindly worshiping Satan'. Note here that 'to take God's name in vain and then teach a false persona of God (i.e., a false god)' is also a blatant violation of God's Primary Commandment, making the New Covenant and God's Primary Commandment synonymous with one another, and essentially interchangeable. As Jesus says in Matthew 5.19 'Anyone who breaks the Primary Commandment, and teaches men to do the same, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven'. Thus, by our religious leaders directly violating the terms of both God's Primary Commandment and the New Covenant (thereby of course making them guilty of 'desecrating Christ's sacrifice that sealed the New Covenant'), they have subsequently been tricked by Satan (being 'blind leaders of the blind') into 'teaching others about who they think God is' (see John 8.54&55), which is really Satan, thereby making people blindly follow and worship 'the false gods made in their (a religious leader's) own image' (i.e., their religions), which in turn promotes 'Satan's hidden caste system of Supremacy', ultimately accomplishing for Satan his main objective of 'tricking humanity into destroying itself through senseless division, war, and hate'... that is blindly and unknowingly done 'in the name of God'.

Is important to realize here that many people know the terminology of the New Covenant in that 'God's laws are written on our hearts and minds'. But what we fail to understand is that the whole point of 'God's laws being written on our hearts and minds' (Hebrews 8.<u>10</u>) is so that 'no one has to teach us about God' (Hebrews 8.11). I.e., verse 11 is the complementing line to verse 10, and it would make no **sense** and be **contradictory** to state that 'God's laws are written on each and every person's heart and mind', then have the very following line say that 'Nonetheless, God's laws must be taught to us by our religious leaders'. Think about it. Why bother saying at all that 'God's laws are already on our hearts and minds' if the implied reasoning for stating verse 10 was not 'so that no one would teach us lies about God'? I.e., if it was truly God's intention for religious leaders to teach us God's laws, then verse 10 (God's laws are written on our hearts and minds) would not have been stated at all. So if God truly wanted the religious leaders to teach us, then the New Covenant would have said 'God will write His laws on sacred tablets and place them in a man-made temple', with the complementing next line saying 'And everyone shall be taught by the religious leaders'. But it doesn't say that, therefore we must understand that the **entire premise** of 'God's laws being written on our hearts (i.e., 'tablets of flesh', 2 Corinthians 3.3) and minds' is so that 'no one has to teach us'. And the New Covenant never would have included the words 'God's laws will be written on our hearts and minds' if the intention of the New Covenant was for 'the religious leaders to continue to teach us their flawed <u>knowledge</u> of God's true persona'. Thus, just the <u>very fact</u> that the New Covenant *mentions* 'God's laws being written on each and every person's heart and mind' implies that 'no one is to teach us God's laws'. And we must therefore realize that, by believing 'God's laws are written on our hearts and minds so that no one has to teach us about God' while also believing that 'Our religious leaders still have to teach us about God', we have essentially believed in Satan's double tongue contradiction that combines

'2 opposing thoughts into 1 thought' to make an absolute nonsense statement; ultimately meaning that our religious leaders, by 'teaching us about God' (which is actually a false god, or just Satan) have turned God's New Covenant into absolute nonsense, saying that they uphold and protect the New Covenant, while being the ones most guilty of nullifying and defiling 'the New Covenant and the entire reason for Christ's death', blindly teaching us Satan's finely crafted lies.

So everyone who belongs to an organized *religion* or *cult* must now look back to their childhood and ask the simple question, 'If the New Covenant says that God's laws are written on our hearts such that <u>no</u> one has to teach us how to know or worship God (remembering 'the true worship of God' = 'simply loving others as ourselves'), then were the religious rituals and ceremonies that I practice (or practiced) written on my heart as something instinctually known, or were they taught to me by a friend, neighbor, parent, or religious leader?' The obvious answer is that 'our religious worship rituals had to be taught to us'. That is, as Children, we did not fabricate religious rituals and ceremonies on our own, and in most cases, we wanted nothing to do with the religious rituals of our elders unless it involved some sort of <u>reward</u>, such as **food**, **money**, or **favoritism**; which is the way elders continue to get young adults to perform rituals, until the young adults take the place of the elders, only to start the same *mindless cycle* over once more. Hence we must recognize that we, claiming to **observe** the New Covenant, contradict ourselves by essentially say 'No one has to teach us how to worship God, but as children we must be taught the worship rituals and ceremonies of our elders'. Now this means that, before our minds were slowly and methodically corrupted by our elders and religious leaders, and our **hearts hardened** by their 'lies disguised as truth', we, as children, <u>already</u> knew God. And if we would have been allowed to grow without the influence of the spiritual perversions of our religious leaders, God would teach us (as we age) 'what is true worship'; remembering again that 'the true worship of God' = 'simply loving others as yourself' as God is Within others, so 'to love others' = 'to love God'. And to further clarify, a 'tender heart' is taught by God as a person ages, teaching them 'what is true right' and 'what is true wrong' by simply 'feeling, in their heart, the pain of others when they hurt someone else, as if (being **one body** of people) the **pain** is **their own**'. That is, a 'tender heart' hits (either spiritually, emotionally, mentally, physically, monetarily, etc.) someone, sees them 'bleed', and doesn't want to hit anymore, whereas a 'hardened heart' justifies their continued hitting, not able to feel the pain of others. Thus we need to come to the realization that we, as children, were taught worship rituals and ceremonies that God never placed on our hearts or in our minds, but rather were placed on our hearts and in our minds by elders and religious leaders who broke the New Covenant, effectively teaching us the false worship of God, and therefore being 'the cause of little ones sinning' (Matthew 18.6), and the cause of hardened hearts; understanding that our religious rituals and ceremonies cause, on 'a macro, seen level', justified supremacy, exclusion, dissent, oppression, and slavery, which is most definitely **not** 'loving others as yourself', thereby making religious rituals and ceremonies definitely not 'the true worship of God', but rather 'the false worship God'. Note here again that this is why 'God wants kindness and mercy, not rituals and ceremonies'. And so ultimately we must 'revert back to childhood' (Matthew 18.3) and humbly unlearn all the religious rituals and ceremonies that we were taught in order to practice the true worship of God,

thereby realizing the <u>true</u> equality, peace, and freedom that is to be attained by adhering to, upholding, and abiding by the <u>true</u> New Covenant. On the side, it must be clarified that, <u>surely</u> we are to teach children how to do certain things, but those things must be taught as 'something <u>you</u> say', <u>not</u> as 'something <u>God</u> says' because 'something <u>you</u> say' only has <u>finite</u> consequences limited to your lifespan, whereas 'something <u>God</u> says' has <u>infinite</u> consequences, spanning untold generations.

Now recognizing that 'the religion (and all of its rituals, ceremonies, etc.) which we were raised into as children was placed on our hearts and in our minds by men, not God', we can therefore see that 'religion is man-made' while 'spirituality is God-made'; noting that Jesus says 'True worshipers worship God in *spirit, not by performing man-made religious deeds'* (John 4.21-23). And if *'religion is man-made'*, then it essentially means that it is a **fabrication** from the mind of Satan to ultimately, in a **hidden way**, cause division and exclusion, that leads to hate, oppression, enslavement, revolution, and war. Think about it. If you don't believe that 'religion is man-made', then it may help to ask yourself the simple question 'What religion is God?' Do Catholics really believe that God is a Catholic? Do Muslims really believe that God is a Muslim? Do Jews really believe that God is a Jew? So to consider this most basic question may help us to understand that our religions are silly man-made fabrications which are nothing more than name barriers which ultimately describe 'all of the false gods that divide the one true God', ultimately dividing humanity. Again we must think, if religion were something that God created and therefore placed on our hearts, why did He place different religions on different people's hearts? Did God do this just to confuse humanity, making us all fight over 'whether or not God is a Catholic, Muslim, or Jew'? And so knowing that it is Satan who would want nothing more than to confuse humanity and make us kill each other over absolutely nothing, you can be sure that is ultimately Satan (using all of his blind religious leaders of varying religions) who has placed *different* religions on *different* people's hearts, making us wrongly believe that 'God placed our religions on our hearts' in order to trick humanity into destroying <u>itself</u> while *thinking* it is the will of God to do so.

Now this effectively means that Satan, knowing that God created the New Covenant as 'something that is written on our hearts', has once again - by sadistically corrupting our minds from an early age so as to not be able to easily differentiate between 'what God wrote on our hearts' and 'what men wrote on our hearts' - concocted a 'false covenant' (or more accurately many different false covenants for many different people). And this false covenant is perceived by our minds as also being 'written on our hearts by God', making us feel, not 'based on what God internally hardwired our hearts to feel', but rather making us feel 'based on what men have placed in our minds', telling us that these man-made things are written on our hearts by God; meaning of course that, Satan's man-made covenants are not really written on our hearts, our minds only think they are, which in turn means that 'they don't even exist', or 'they are false and made-up'. So Satan, from an early age, starts fabricating a false conscience (or false covenant of laws based on redefined good and evil) that stands (so we think) right beside and intertwined with our true conscience (think here of 'the tares being planted side-by-side with the wheat'), with that false conscience (appearing to be indistinguishable from our true conscience) being taught to abide by 'the set of false beliefs associated with our particular religion'. And of course each and every religion, to some degree, teaches people (whether spoken or unspoken) to abide by ideas

such as A) 'Through our religion alone you will attain salvation', B) 'People of other religions (or no religion) are spiritually inferior to us in the eyes of God', and C) 'We practice authentic worship' (implying of course, in a **deceptively positive** way, that everyone else practices 'false worship'), with these things representing the <u>supreme</u> and <u>exclusive</u> mindset of the Jews that Jesus <u>directly opposed</u> (i.e., 'The first will be last' from 'The Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard'). Note here that, if you don't think that Satan's false covenants produce **supremacy**, then consider 'Why do people convert to other, <u>better</u> religions? And why do people want others to <u>convert</u> to their <u>better</u> religion?' So knowing that God's true New Covenant is one of equality (i.e., 'the equality clause') and subsequent inclusion in **eternal life** for 'everyone from the least to the greatest who truly concedes to the words of Christ', religious followers who believe in 'No salvation outside their religion' must ask themselves, 'Has excluding others from salvation, based on their religious affiliation, been placed in my heart by God as a part of His **New Covenant**, or **by Satan** as part of his **false covenant**?' Or 'Are the laws of **supremacy** and exclusion, which I adhere to as being a divinely inspired truth of my religion, been taught to me by my true conscience (i.e., God), or by my false conscience (i.e., Satan and his ministers)?' Thus we must realize that Satan sadistically 'planted his tares' in our hearts as children in order to cause internal division (literally 'tearing our hearts in 2') and conflict between 'our true conscience that abides by God's true New Covenant' and 'a false man-made conscience that abides by Satan's false covenant', thereby making us blindly serve '2 Gods' (i.e., one true God and one false god), all while thinking that we are serving only one God. And so just as with 'the wheat and the tares', we need to identify 'Satan's false conscience and false covenant that has sprouted in our hearts' so that it may be sorted and burned, thereby leaving us with one true conscience, one true (New) Covenant, and one true God (Zechariah 14.9)... and of course internal unity and peace that ultimately translates to external unity and peace.

We must therefore now recognize that the *false covenants* which our <u>varying</u> religious leaders have placed in our hearts, <u>disguising</u> them as 'covenants or laws of God', are what lead to <u>external conflict</u>. That is, if 'a Catholic abides by a Catholic covenant', 'a Muslim abides by a Muslim covenant', and 'a Jew abides by a Jewish covenant', with them <u>all</u> proudly believing that 'their covenant <u>best</u> describes God', then, from 'a macro level, large-scale, <u>herd</u> or <u>mob mentality</u> perspective', this will eventually lead to <u>external conflict</u>, as each respective person is **blindly** following and <u>fighting</u> to protect 'a false religious covenant of man-made laws' (or a false god) which they <u>think</u> is 'God's covenant of true laws'. Interestingly enough Buddha told a parable about 'religious leaders or monks who were always fighting, quarreling, and arguing about <u>differing viewpoints</u> on spiritual matters, the afterlife, and essentially God's true persona'; that is, they were fighting about their differing false religious covenants. And in this parable, Buddha claimed that they - being proud, arrogant, and stiff-necked - were all therefore <u>blind</u> in that 'the way they described God was <u>nothing even close</u> to who or what God <u>really</u> is'. 'The <u>Parable of the Blind Men and the Elephant</u>' is as follows.

The $\underline{\mathbf{1}}^{\text{st}}$ blind man walked up to an elephant, grabbed his $\underline{\mathbf{ear}}$ and said '<u>It's a fan</u>'. A $\underline{\mathbf{2}}^{\text{nd}}$ blind man walked up to the elephant, grabbed his $\underline{\mathbf{trunk}}$ and said '<u>It's a rope</u>'. A $\underline{\mathbf{3}}^{\text{rd}}$ blind man grabbed the

elephant's <u>leg</u> and said '<u>It's a tree</u>'. In the end, none of the blind men could <u>agree</u> on 'what <u>it</u> was that they all <u>felt</u>'. So, <u>out of **pride**, they **killed** each other.</u>

So if we say in this parable that A) each blind man is representative of 'each of our religions (including Buddhism) as a whole' - or 'the 1st blind man' = 'a Catholic abiding by the Catholic covenant', 'the 2nd blind man' = 'a Muslim abiding by a Muslim covenant', and so on - and B) the elephant is representative of God, then we can easily see how wrong each of our religions are concerning God's true persona, as they have essentially described God as being 'a fan, a rope, and a tree', when in reality God is actually (in a figurative sense) 'an enormous elephant'. And of course, by each of our religions proudly, arrogantly, pompously, and (consequently) blindly asserting that 'their version of God, which looks like a fan, a root, or a tree' is 'what God really looks like', they ultimately end up killing each other... while none of them are even close to the right. In other words, none of our religions are even remotely close to describing 'who or what God is', yet they are all so sure 'their pathetically wrong version of God describes God's true persona' that they are willing to kill others, and die protecting their pride and enormous egos. Thus we must realize that the false covenants which our religious leaders have placed in our hearts have made us 'blind men', blindly fighting over 'versions of God' that are SO far from 'the true version of God'; just as 'a fan, a rope, and a tree' are so far from being an elephant.

Now by our religious leaders breaking the New Covenant and teaching us (for Satan) their various false covenants, they have (for Satan) blindly organized us 'blind men' into what are essentially 'blind **mobs'** (i.e., 'the supposedly sacred Sabbath assemblies that God hates' in Amos 5.21-24 and Isaiah 1.11-17) who kill each other for no reason at all; once again fulfilling Satan's main objective of 'tricking humanity into blindly destroying itself'. Of course our religious leaders will assert that 'Christ commanded us to assemble or gather into groups', while referencing and misinterpreting Matthew 18.20: "For where <u>2</u> or <u>3</u> are <u>gathered together</u> in <u>My name</u>, I am there in the midst of them". But we must realize here that A) if Christ's persona has been changed and defiled by false prophets and false teachers breaking the 2nd Commandment and the New Covenant, then people are *really* gathering (into mobs) in the name of a false Jesus (or Satan). And B) even if 2 or 3 people gather in Christ's name, Matthew 18.20 Never says anything about 'a (false) mediator then teaching for Jesus, or speaking for Jesus', as these are the things that defile Christ's name and therefore make gathering in His name worthless, and against the will of God by actually 'gathering people into Satan's blind mobs'. Additionally, our religious leaders will <u>also</u> assert the 'Christ commanded us to go forth and make disciples of all nations, teaching them to observe all things that Christ commanded' (Matthew 28.19-20). But again, not even knowing what the true Good News of the New Covenant is, and that Christ came to abolish religion (which is truly Good News), our religious leaders have been blindly teaching people a false or Anti-Good News (see Section 12) that is 'a message of supremacy (i.e., 'we have a better way of worshiping God that you') and enslavement' - instead of 'the message of equality and freedom that Christ <u>commanded</u>' - thereby <u>blindly</u> <u>making disciples</u> of all the <u>nations for Satan</u> (<u>not</u> Jesus); remembering here that, prior to Christ's return, 'Even the elect will be deceived' (Matthew 24.24), and 'Satan will deceive all the nations' (Revelation 12.9)... which is why Isaiah 34.2 says "For the indignation

of the Lord is against **all** nations". As a note here, we must not be deceived by beautifully deceptive terms, such as evangelization, as Satan has taught our religious leaders both a false persona of Christ and a false Good News, thereby meaning that they are blindly evangelizing and recruiting for Satan. As Jesus says in Matthew 23.15 'Woe to you, religious leaders, for you travel by land and by sea, evangelizing and converting people, ultimately making those converts (or proselytes) twice the disciples of Satan as yourselves'; realizing here that, as much as a religious leader may try to preach and evangelize 'a message of equality and inclusion', Satan will ultimately change that religious leader's intentions, after he is dead and gone, into 'a message of supremacy and exclusion'. So by evangelizing, recruiting, and gathering people together every Sunday in the name of Christ (or Muhammad, Buddha, etc.), then teaching and speaking lies from behind the name of Christ (i.e., teaching an Anti-Good News), our religious leaders have unknowingly turned all the nations into Satan's unknowing disciples, all gathered into their respective blind mobs (according to the name of their religion or false god) who are essentially being 'called into battle' and rallied to blindly fight for one of Satan's well disguised false gods; with Satan of course relying on 'the <u>false conscience</u> that he instilled in people <u>as a child</u>' to get people to kill each other while thinking it is in accordance with their true conscience (i.e., God's true laws of the New Covenant). Thus, while our religious leaders think that they are *gathering* everyone each and every **Sunday** (or **Sabbath**) in order to 'make disciples of all nations for the kingdom of God', the fact is that they have unknowingly been creating 'disciples for the kingdom of Satan', organizing large groups of people into blind mobs who (remembering that idolatry involves large groups of people all acting in unison as a herd) are so engulfed in their mob (or herd) that they can't see outside of it to even know that 'it is a mob'. And so this of course means that, while we think that we are gathering every Sabbath to 'pray for peace and the end of war', us gathering into mobs and practicing the mob mentality of 'we have a better way of worshiping God than you' is actually 'what **causes war** in the first place'; not 'what prevents war'. As Exodus 23.2 says "You shall not follow a (mob) to do evil"; recognizing here that Satan's deceptions are without boundaries, and he essentially names his mobs with the righteous names of 'God, Jesus, Muhammad, Buddha, etc.' so that people 'blindly follow his mobs to do evil and start wars' while thinking that they are 'following a mob (insert here any one of Satan's **beautifully disguised** false gods) to do **good** and **prevent war**'. Hence, while it is true that we gather every Sunday and think that by doing so we are unified, by us 'gathering or assembling into blind mobs' we are ultimately causing the division of humanity, thereby 'blindly qathering to essentially scatter for Satan'... again why 'God hates our supposedly sacred Sabbath assemblies' (Amos 5.21-24 and Isaiah 1.11-17).

We must consider here **why** our religious leaders (i.e., **mob bosses**) **form mobs** in the first place: **control, power, glory, money, etc.** That is, 'they love to be **Seen** by men in **public** and be **the center of attention**' (Matthew 6.5), 'they love the <u>seats of honor</u>', and 'they love people bowing to their <u>supposed knowledge</u>, being called 'Rabbi, Rabbi'' (Matthew 23.6-7). So knowing that men (i.e., false prophets, false teachers, false mediators, etc.) create their <u>own</u> mobs (i.e., our religions) ultimately <u>to have their mob honor</u> and **glorify** them (or their **hierarchy** in general), an important aspect of the New Covenant

(which also speaks of Jesus' true persona) is that our relationship with God be personal and private, not public, as it is a direct relationship with God. If you don't believe that 'God does not want us to gather or assemble together as we are accustomed to doing on the Sabbath' - keeping in mind that we are ultimately assembling on the Sabbath to worship 'varying false personas of God' - then Why would Jesus **bother** saying at all 'Don't pray in the **temples** or on the street corners where you can be seen in public, rather pray to God in private, in your bedroom' (Matthew 6.5-6). Think about it. Does this not directly contradict our customary public gatherings and assemblies on every Sabbath? So this is why God said in Isaiah 1.13&14 'My soul hates when you <u>assemble</u> on the <u>Sabbath</u>', as the people were no doubt A) assembling into blind mobs, worshipping either false personas of God or other false gods, and **B)** defiling the true intentions of the Sabbath as being 'a <u>day of rest</u> from vain men who practice enslavement'. Therefore, as men (in order to glorify themselves) have a certain tendency to form mobs who think that 'their public relationship with God is **better** than (which is supremacy) the **next** mob's public relationship with God' - saying in an unspoken way, 'We have a better, more authentic way of worshiping God than you, therefore we **know** God **better** than you, we **are** better than you, and we will receive salvation before you' - we must recognize that the New Covenant demands and requires that our (direct) relationship with God be private and personal. And this is so because, as we <u>divide</u> into mobs who think that they are <u>superior</u> to the next mob (which in itself **defiles** the <u>equality</u> of the New Covenant itself), a **chain reaction** begins where **supremacy** leads to 'exclusion, dissent, and division', which leads to 'hate and oppression', ultimately leading to revolution and war; realizing here that we must be <u>leery</u> of <u>any named mob, club, organization, etc.</u>, as they have a tendency to **create** separatism and division. Thus, if 'God already knows the things we need (i.e., peace, happiness, freedom, etc.) before we even ask Him' (Matthew 6.8), and 'the true worship of God' is simply 'loving others as ourselves', then we must realize that the real reason Why our religious leaders gather and assemble us into blind mobs on every Sabbath is ultimately 'to worship and glorify them' (disguised as worshiping God of course). And by publicly gathering into our blind mobs every Sabbath, we in fact oppose the command of Jesus to 'speak to God in private', thereby also opposing the very essence of the New Covenant, which is a *private* and *direct* relationship that is <u>not</u> to be '<u>compared</u> to others (i.e., other people or other mobs) in a <u>public setting</u>'; as this no doubt presents 'the <u>seeds</u> of the supremacy complexes of our blind mobs', and consequently 'the seeds of division, war, and hate'. So again, the mob mentality that we practice every Sunday in churches, temples, synagogues, etc. actually causes war; it does not prevent war. And we have been tricked by our religious leaders into 'forming mobs made in the image of our religious leaders' (the mob being a sort of 'living reflection' of a religious leader's false god) purely for their continued prosperity, wealth, honor, control, and power, which in turn perpetually propagates their 'hidden caste system of supremacy'... of course thereby perpetually propagating 'division, war, and hate'.

Now with the New Covenant demanding that people deal *personally*, *privately*, and *directly* with God, hence *eliminating* all of our religious leaders who *think* that they are <u>necessary mediators</u> for Jesus and

God, most religious leaders (being blindly born into wrongly believing that their job as 'religious leader' is an integral part of human society as God intended) will no doubt say 'Who will run God's church if you do away with us?' But the whole point of the New Covenant is that 'no one will run God's church', as there is no more *literal* church or temple (with 4 walls and a roof) to run because we, by worshiping God in spirit (i.e., simply loving others as yourself), and not by performing rituals and ceremonies in literal churches and temples (John 4.21-23), actually create a 'figurative, living temple' (as opposed to dead, inanimate temples) made up of a 'body of people' who act individually as 'living stones' (see Section 15). Note here that this (the **not** worshiping in **literal** temples) of course being because of the previously mentioned 'formation of blind mobs' who have Superiority complexes that breed, on a macro level, division, war, and hate. Remember also here that "God, who made the world and everything in it, since He is Lord of heaven and earth, does **not live** in **temples** made by human hands. Nor is He worshiped by anything men can supply (such as 'worthless words, rituals, and ceremonies'), as though He needed anything, since He gives to all life, breath, and all things" (Acts 17.24-25). And Exodus 20.23 says 'You shall not make anything (including temples or any other false idol) to be with God'. And so essentially, God's intention with the New Covenant is to have 'a body of people' (i.e., humanity) that functions <u>autonomously</u> (with Jesus has the 'Head' of this body) and <u>independent</u> of man-made interference and false mediation; that is, independent of 'anything men can supply', such as rituals, ceremonies, etc. which are performed in 'dead, man-made temples'. If this seems impossible for our religious leaders to believe, then, considering that, in the Bible 'a body or group of people' is frequently paralleled to 'a human body' (which is discussed momentarily), we must realize guite simply that our human bodies are themselves autonomous; which itself points to God's intention of having 'an autonomous body of people' from the beginning of time. Think about it. A human body operates by powers in the unseen world and not by any man-made device. An unfathomable Source of eternal energy, light, and power makes all of the bodies on planet earth run independent of any manmade device or interference. So if 'a human body' is an autonomous body, operating independent of anything men can supply, is it so hard to believe that 'a body of people' can also be an autonomous body? That is, is it so hard to believe that 'God's body of people' does not need religious leaders to work properly? Look at how animals instinctively know how to hunt and survive even if they are orphaned at an early age. Who or what teaches them? What we call 'instinct' is God's autonomy of all living things. Think about 'involuntary actions' and how some Source far beyond our comprehension is responsible for their function; regardless of whether or not we want them to function. You can sit as still as possible and 'think' your heart to stop, yet it still pumps blood whether you want it to or not. And so your human body is running autonomously on the breath of God's Spirit; independent of your mind. I.e., without you doing anything, your human body still functions on involuntary actions, and your body breathes only by the breath and will of God's Spirit, not by your own will. Therefore, if God set up a human body to run autonomously, surely God can do the Same with 'a body of people', having it run independent of the false mediation of our religious leaders. And this independent, autonomous body of people, who deal directly with God without the <u>need</u> of our religious leaders to <u>teach</u> them (as if *teaching* a human body to **breathe**), is the essence of the New Covenant.

As already mentioned, the Bible frequently <u>parallels</u> or <u>likens</u> 'a <u>body of people</u>' to 'a <u>human body</u>', thereby giving the word 'body' <u>double meaning</u>. And this is done in order to try to make and explain varying points, which are as follows.

<u>A)</u> Just as a *foot* and a *hand* are all connected to the <u>same</u> *human body*, we too, being <u>like</u> a *foot* or a *hand*, are all connected to the <u>same</u> *body* (or *group*) *of people* so that, just as a *hand* in some way <u>knows</u> if a *foot* is <u>in pain</u> (**both** being *members* connected to the <u>same</u> *human body*), we too (being *members* connected to the <u>same</u> *body of people*) in some way <u>know</u> if *another member* (or *person*) is <u>in pain</u>, and should therefore <u>show mercy</u>; as with your own human body, your *hand* would no doubt show mercy to your <u>hurt foot</u>. And we must realize here that this parallel is made to try and **convey** the <u>essence</u> of *'love your neighbor as*

yourself', because if we can understand that 'we are one body of people' just like being 'one human body', then it is **harder** to 'hate your neighbor', as it would be **like** hating yourself. That is, your own eye would not look at your own ear and say 'I hate you, ear', but would rather at least try to 'understand the ear', 'make up excuses for the ear', 'help the ear', etc. This is why Paul says 'For no one ever hated his OWN body' (Ephesians 5.29). So once you understand that 'hating a member of the body of people with malicious intent' is just like 'you hating some part of your own body with malicious intent', then suddenly it becomes a lot harder to truly 'hate your neighbor'.

B) Just as a *human body* becomes <u>sick</u>, <u>infected</u>, and <u>diseased</u>, so <u>too</u> does the *body of people* become <u>sick</u>, <u>infected</u>, and <u>diseased</u>, with each and every *member* (or *person*) of the *body of people*, in some way, whether **knowingly** or **unknowingly**, being sick, infected, and diseased to <u>some degree</u>.

C) Just as the body of people experiences <u>pain</u> and <u>agony</u>, so <u>too</u> was that <u>pain</u> and <u>agony</u> experienced by Christ's physical body; which is of course referring to 'Christ's body <u>bearing the sins</u> of the body of people' (see Isaiah 53.6 & 1 Peter 2.24). Also note here that this, 'Christ actually feeling in His physical body what is felt by an entire body of people', is what Paul is referring to as 'a great mystery' Ephesians 5.32, as we must remember that, at the Same time, 'Jesus' physical body also feels what God feels'; ultimately meaning that, contained within 'the actual <u>living</u>, breathing body of Christ' is 'the entire essence of both God and humanity'.

It must first be noted with 'C' (in the previous list) that this terminology, 'the body of Christ', has been grossly misinterpreted and misunderstood, and is a source of great Catholic error (see Section 8). And so it is important to understand here (and remember for future reference) that 'the body of Christ' does have double meaning (again, see Section 8), as 'Christ's literal, physical body' feels what 'Christ's body of people' feel, so that 'the body of Christ' means either 'Christ Himself' (i.e. the living and breathing Christ, not any false idol that is named 'Christ') or 'Christ's people', yet at the same time both ultimately mean the same thing (this being 'the great mystery') and are somewhat interchangeable, as

they are inseparable and 'one unit' (or 'one flesh' in Ephesians 5.31). As Ephesians 5.30 and 32 says 'For we are members of **His body**... which, being a **great mystery**, is **Christ** and the **church**'; noting here that **'church'** means 'a **group** or body of people', and also that this 'group or body of people' (**implied** here to not include Christ for clearer imagery) is being referred to in Ephesians 5.31 as 'Jesus' wife or 'bride', which is important for later discussion. Therefore it should be clarified that, although Paul is referring to 'Christ and His bride' as 'one flesh' or 'one whole, complete body', as if they are already married, 'the marriage of Christ to His bride' has not yet occurred (see Revelation 19.7) as Christ has not yet returned; meaning of course that 'the body of believers in Christ is still broken and the flock still scattered' (Matthew 26.26&31). So this has the implication that, as Christ is **physically separated** from His wife, Christ and 'the rest of the body', are **not** 'one whole body'. Yet at the **same time** (making this 'a great mystery') Christ is somehow spiritually inseparable from His wife so that they are 'one whole body'; which is why there is a sort of wavering back and forth between Jesus saying 'The body is broken just like a <u>broken loaf</u> of bread' (Matthew 26.26&31), and Paul saying 'The body is one <u>whole</u>, just as one <u>whole</u> loaf of bread' (1 Corinthians 10.17). And so we must realize that this figurative language sometimes implies that 'body' = 'a group of people not including Christ' to convey the idea of being 'Jesus's bride', which is a sort of 'broken, Headless body', where Christ is 'the Head of the body' (Colossians 1.18) or 'the Bridegroom' who is not **yet** joined to 'the rest of the body' (or His wife or bride), thereby making 'one whole body' or 'one flesh' (Ephesians 5.31); of course noting that 'body' sometimes implies 'a group of people including Christ'. Consider the following quotes that reiterate this idea of paralleling or likening 'a body or group of people' to 'a human body' and (mainly for future reference) 'a loaf of bread'.

- 1. Isaiah 1.5&6, opening his book with the parallel that 'the **people** of **Israel** and **Judah**' are like 'a human body', says "The whole <u>head</u> is <u>sick</u>, and the whole <u>heart</u> faints. From the sole of the <u>foot</u> even to the <u>head</u>, there is no soundness in it, but <u>wounds</u>, and <u>bruises</u>, and <u>putrefying</u> <u>sores</u>."
- 2. In 1 Corinthians 10.16&17, Paul, making the parallel between 'one unified loaf of bread' and 'one unified body of people who believe in Christ', says "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, though many, are one bread and one body; for we all partake of that one bread." So here Paul is saying that 'By breaking bread together, we are coming together (i.e., communing) to form a unified body of people who are one mind with Christ'; noting that Paul, in Colossians 1.18, likens Christ to 'the Head or Mind of the body', with us being 'the rest of the body'. Additionally, this of course is one of the quotes that Catholicism will assert as meaning 'The bread which we break, is it not the coming together to eat the literal flesh (i.e., body) of Christ?' But this gross, defiled misinterpretation of 'the body of Christ' being 'the literal flesh of Christ' instead of 'a body of people' is, as mentioned, the source of great error in the Catholic Church (see Section 8).
- 3. In 1 Corinthians 12.12-27 Paul illustrates this parallel in <u>detail</u>, saying that 'Just as an <u>eye</u> or a <u>hand</u> are <u>different members</u> of a <u>human body</u>, <u>we</u> (being likened to an eye or a hand) are <u>different members</u> of the <u>body of believers</u> in Christ'. As Paul says in 1 Corinthians 12.27, "You (as a whole group of people) <u>are</u> the <u>body</u> of Christ, and <u>members</u> individually". And to clarify for

the following discussion, 'member' is being given double meaning as A) a member of the human body, such as an eye or a hand, and B) a member of a group or body of people (i.e., a member = a person or individual). So 'an eye or a hand' represents 'individual persons' belonging to a whole group or body of people'; i.e., 'an eye' would usually symbolize 'a leader' or 'visionary', with 'a hand' symbolizing anything from 'a worker' to 'a thief' (which once again implies a leader who extorts, or teaches, at least by example, other people ways of manipulating money and people for gain).

Now the <u>whole point</u> of this discussion about 'the body' is that the New Covenant was established by God so that there would be 'one autonomous body of people' so that humanity (led by our governments and leaders) will function with ease and fluidity, just as 'a healthy human body' breathes and pumps blood effortlessly and independent of our minds telling it to do so. But the stipulation is that, Christ, being the sole Mediator of the New Covenant, is to be the 'Head', 'Mind', or 'Eyes' of that body of people, directing the body just as your mind or your eyes tell your human body where to walk so that you don't 'fall into a ditch' (Matthew 15.14). And as we can see, humanity, under the guidance of bad leaders who act as false 'heads, minds, eyes, etc.', has been (for thousands of years) like 'an unsound human body', walking around 'without a head', or 'with a deranged mind and two blind, bad eyes', thereby walking straight into 'a ditch of desolation'... all because of their rejection of the true Christ and the true New Covenant. Thus we must ultimately come to realize that, in their rejection of the New Covenant and Christ as 'the true Head of the body', 'good (seeing) Eyes of the body', or 'the true <u>Husband'</u>, our 'religious leaders and the governmental leaders they <u>influence</u> as **hidden kings'** have, essentially 'trampling the Son of God and the blood of the New Covenant underfoot' (Hebrews 10.29), acted as false or bad 'heads, minds, eyes, hands, etc.', thereby causing the entire 'body of people' to sin (or 'walk into a ditch'). And they have acted as false husbands, taking the place of Jesus (the true Husband or Bridegroom), thereby committing 'figurative adultery' with Jesus' wife or bride; remembering that Ephesians 5.31&32 says that 'Jesus' wife or bride' = 'Jesus' body or group of believers'.

Since we can now recognize that, A) terms such as 'eyes, hands, and feet', in addition to terms such as 'fornicator and adulterer' as already noted in Section 1 (and see also Section 17), are speaking symbolically (i.e., in code) about 'people who violate and reject true New Covenant, God's Primary Commandment, and the true Christ, thereby Causing sin', and B) that these coded terms (i.e., body, eyes, hands, feet, fornicator, and adulterer) are speaking not an individual, literal level of a human body (except in the case of Christ, feeling in His body what the body of people feels), but on a macro, figurative level (remembering that idolatry or 'figurative adultery' is seen on a macro level) where a 'human body' symbolizes 'a large body of people', then we can also recognize that we have inherited defiled misinterpretations of biblical passages that use these 'coded terms'. And these misinterpretations are so defiled because these passages are actually written about leaders (particularly religious) who, by breaking the New Covenant and teaching error, Cause multitudes (i.e., the entire body of people for many, many generations) to live in darkness, being blindly led into hell; Yet these passages are wrongly interpreted by our blind religious leaders (who again can't see that these passages

are written <u>about them</u>) as being on an <u>individual, literal level</u> of a human body. So these <u>defiled</u> <u>misinterpretations</u> then of course <u>simultaneously</u> project <u>unrighteous guilt</u> and <u>shame</u> on people's <u>individual sexuality</u> (which of course translates to <u>conflict</u> among <u>families</u> and <u>communities</u>), while <u>obscuring</u> the <u>real sin</u> of the religious leaders (acting as Satan's <u>human stand-ins</u>) committing <u>'figurative fornication'</u> with the <u>bride</u> of Christ, which leads to widespread, <u>macro level 'division</u>, <u>war</u>, <u>and hate'</u>; noting here also that these <u>defiled misinterpretations wrongly portray</u> Christ (i.e., they <u>redefine</u> His <u>persona</u>) as expecting some sort of <u>'inhuman standard of sexual sterilization'</u>, monitoring and overseeing our individual sexuality, when this is <u>not</u> the case at all, as Christ was concerned with <u>'the macro level harlotry of nations</u> who <u>figuratively fornicate</u> with Satan, any of his human stand-ins, or any of his false gods'. Therefore, we should <u>identify</u> that <u>Matthew 5.27-30</u> and <u>Luke 11.33-36</u> (with setup in verses 29-32) are <u>2 well-known</u> passages that use these <u>'coded terms'</u> and have been grossly misinterpreted, in order to therefore <u>'decode'</u> them. But first, one of the <u>most important</u> passages in <u>decoding</u> Matthew 5.27-30 and Luke 11.33-36 is <u>Matthew 18.6-9</u>; which is as follows.

"Whoever <u>Causes</u> one of these little ones to <u>sin</u>, it would be better if he were drowned in the depth of the sea. Woe to the <u>world</u> (i.e., the <u>entire <u>body of people</u>) because of sins! For sins must come, but woe to that <u>man</u> (i.e., the <u>hand, foot, or eye</u>) who <u>Causes the sin!</u> If your <u>hand</u> or <u>foot</u> causes <u>you</u> (i.e., the <u>world</u> or the <u>entire <u>body of people</u>) to <u>sin</u>, <u>cut it off</u> and <u>cast it from you</u>. It is better for you to enter into life lame or maimed, rather than having 2 hands or 2 feet, and be cast into <u>hell</u>. And if your <u>eye</u> causes <u>you</u> to <u>sin</u>, <u>pluck it out</u> and <u>cast it from you</u>. It is better for you to enter into life with 1 eye, rather than having 2 eyes, and be cast into hell."</u></u>

And so considering the preceding paragraphs about 'a body of people' (i.e., 'the world' in this passage) being symbolized with 'a human body', with 'members of a human body', such as 'eyes, hands, and feet' symbolizing 'members or individual persons of a large body of people' (i.e., 'that man' in this passage), it becomes Obvious that this passage is so important because it directly defines (by Jesus Himself) 'eyes, hands, and feet' as figuratively being 'individual persons', and not literal parts of a human body; which is crucial in decoding the following 2 passages. And of course, it must be noted here that, since A) Jesus spent the majority of His time opposing the religious leaders, and B) Jesus just told the Apostles in Matthew 16.5-12 to 'Beware of the false knowledge or doctrine spoken by the Pharisees and Sadducees, which causes others to sin', then you can be sure that:

'eyes, hands, and feet in Matthew 18.6-9' = 'the religious leaders (or the strictly religious)'

And this is so because, as the religious leaders break the **New Covenant** by **teaching** others **false knowledge**, they **cause**, or are **responsible** for sending **'the entire body of people'** to **hell**; hence the necessity for them to be **'plucked out of power'** and **'cut off from their seats of authority'**. So after realizing this **indisputable** definition of **'eyes**, **hands**, **and feet'** by Jesus <u>Himself</u>, and that these terms, in addition to terminology pertaining to **adultery** and **fornication**, are on a **macro**, **figurative level** (**not** a micro, individual, literal level), we can now easily **'decode' Matthew 5.27-30**, then **Luke 11.33-36**;

remembering here that Jesus cloaked or 'coded' His words with parables and figurative language in order to avoid immediate arrest, and be able to speak openly about 'abolishing the religious hierarchy'. Also note here the almost identical wording (in terms of 'eyes being plucked out', 'hands being cut off', 'cast it from you', and 'the body being cast the hell') to Matthew 18.6-9, which of course points to the fact that 'members' in Matthew 5.27-30 are 'individual persons' (i.e., the religious leaders), not 'literal members of a human body'. And so, noting that verse 27 is 'the literal old adultery Commandment', with verses 28-30 putting that commandment on a macro, figurative level, Jesus says in Matthew 5.27-30:

"You have heard that it was said to those of old, 'You shall not commit <u>adultery</u>'. But I say to you that <u>whoever</u> looks at a <u>woman</u> to <u>lust</u> for her has already committed (*figurative*) <u>adultery</u> with her in his heart. If your right <u>eye</u> causes <u>you</u> to <u>sin</u>, <u>pluck it out</u> and <u>cast it from you</u>; for it is more profitable for you that one of your <u>members</u> perish, than for your <u>whole body</u> (i.e., the <u>world</u> or the <u>entire</u> <u>body of people</u>) to be cast into <u>hell</u>. And if your right <u>hand</u> causes <u>you</u> to <u>sin</u>, <u>cut it off</u> and <u>cast it from you</u>; for it is more profitable for you that one of your <u>members</u> perish, than for your <u>whole body</u> to be cast into <u>hell</u>."

In Matthew 5.27-30 (as opposed to Luke 11.33-36) we must understand that Jesus is moving from A) 'one set of symbolic terms' (speaking symbolically in terms of a macro level bride and false husbands) to B) 'a <u>second</u> set of symbolic terms' (speaking symbolically in terms of a *macro level body of people* and bad body parts, such as an eye or a hand) in the **same** CONTEXT. And if you don't think that Jesus was combining both of these 'sets of terms' in the same context, then consider that Paul does the same as Jesus and combines these **2** 'sets of terms' in **one line**, saying, 'Shall I take members of the body of people who believe in Christ and make them members of a body of people who act as a harlot' (1 Corinthians 6.15); which clarifies (as in the following equation #1) that 'the macro level body of people' = 'a macro level woman or bride' who, in this case (and just as Jesus was implying of 'the woman' in Matthew 5.27-30), is acting as 'a macro level harlot'. And again, combining both of these 'sets of terms' in the same context, Paul says 'You (the Galatians) would have plucked out your eyes who zealously court you' (Galatians 4.15&17), with 'court' implying 'figurative adultery by false husbands (i.e., bad eyes) who pervert the gospel'; as noted at the beginning of Galatians (1.7). Also note here how these 'false bridegrooms' are actually 'a part or members of the bride', which makes their 'courting' quite **defiled** and **warped**, as they have no doubt (**during** the life of Jesus) treated Jesus **as if** 'He was part of the bride', when He was actually the true Bridegroom. Now to clarify the parallels of these 'sets of terms', examine the following figurative or symbolic equations; noting here that Revelation 21.9 says that 'the woman' = 'the Lamb's bride', and also that 2 John 1.1&13 implies 'the elect lady and her sister' are different 'bodies of people'.

- 1. <u>woman</u> = <u>macro level bride or wife</u> = <u>macro level body of people</u>
- 2. <u>whoever</u> = <u>false bridegrooms</u> or <u>husbands</u> (as Jesus is the <u>true</u> Bridegrooms or <u>Husband</u>) = <u>a</u> <u>bad eye</u> or <u>bad hand</u> that causes the macro level body of people to sin

One thing we must realize here is that, because of their *figurative adultery* (i.e., idolatry), <u>God</u>

divorced His people hundreds of years previous to this (see Jeremiah 3.8), as 'she was playing the harlot', with Isaiah (1.21) essentially setting up his entire book by calling them (i.e., an entire nation of people) 'a harlot'. So as Christ has yet to return to essentially be remarried to them, the 'woman' or 'bride' here is technically a 'bride-to-be', and is who is being referred to in the following Matthew 5.32 (see also Matthew 19.9) as 'a woman who is divorced' (see Section 17). And secondly, we must realize that 'lusting after Jesus' bride' means 'wanting to rule over, enslave, and corrupt the body of people' (i.e., lusting after power and authority so that this supreme mindset leads to widespread 'division, war, and hate'). Now considering these points, and remembering that Jesus many times was referencing the writings of the Prophets who used the same macro level imagery of 'the nations of Israel and Judah' being 'an adulterous woman' - see Ezekiel 23.1-4 where 'Samaria and Jerusalem' = '2 women who were married to God, and played the harlot with other gods' - Matthew 5.27-30 actually translates as follows.

'If a <u>false bridegroom</u> (i.e., false mediator, false prophet, false teacher, etc.) looks at the <u>macro</u> <u>level bride</u> of <u>Christ</u> wanting (<u>Iusting</u>) to <u>rule over</u> and <u>corrupt</u> her, he is already <u>guilty</u> of committing <u>figurative adultery</u> against God (realizing that the <u>false bridegroom</u> is acting as <u>Satan's human stand-in</u>, thereby <u>defiling</u> the <u>marriage covenant</u> between Jesus and His bride). So, as these false husbands are <u>like</u> a <u>bad eye</u> or a <u>bad hand</u> is to the <u>macro level body of people</u>, <u>Causing</u> the <u>whole body</u> to <u>sin</u>, they (that is, these <u>bad members</u> of the body of people) must be <u>plucked out</u> or <u>cut off</u> (i.e. <u>taken out of power</u>) so that the <u>whole body</u> of people is not thrown in <u>hell</u>.'

So by understanding the true figurative language being spoken by Christ, it becomes <u>obvious</u> that 'the term <u>eye</u> or <u>hand</u>' is referring to a <u>person</u> (usually a religious leader) who, because of wanting to <u>rule</u> over, enslave, and <u>have ownership</u> of God's people, must be <u>taken out of power</u> and <u>stopped</u> (i.e., plucked out or cut off) from essentially leading an entire multitude into generations of <u>desolation</u> and <u>darkness</u>. Now we must also realize (being <u>equally</u> important) that, just as with their blatant misinterpretations of the <u>Prodigal Son</u>, our religious leaders have played, with our minds, '<u>the turn it</u> around <u>qame</u>' (i.e., 'the <u>guilty</u> condemning the innocent to <u>appear innocent</u>'), thereby condemning individuals as <u>having 'literal lustful eyes'</u>, when in truth they are guilty of <u>being 'figurative lustful eyes'</u>. In other words, our religious leaders' interpretations of this passage - i.e., that Jesus was in some way suggesting that an <u>individual literally</u> 'cut off their hand' or 'pluck out their eye' for being <u>sexually</u> attracted to a woman, and <u>simply having God-given natural sexual desires</u> (see Section 16) - is <u>total nonsense</u>, and exactly the misinterpretations that Satan has thrived on to <u>create</u> his '<u>false</u>, <u>sexually sterilized</u>, <u>less than human Jesus'</u> which has made countless generations live in <u>unrighteous guilt</u> and <u>shame</u> about the natural sexuality that God hardwired them to have all along. Remember, Satan's sadistic lies know <u>no boundaries</u>.

Now to reinforce that 'an eye' in Matthew 5.27-30 is referring to 'a person', not 'a literal part of our human bodies', let's examine Luke 11.33-36. This passage uses the same symbolic language of 'a human body' = 'a body of people', yet by examining the verses in Luke 11.29-32 (immediately before Luke 11.33-36), it becomes apparent that Jesus is referring to Himself as 'a good Eye' (or Eyes) that brings light into the body of people, with 'a bad eye' representing 'a religious leader' (i.e., a Pharisee, Scribe, Chief Priest, etc.) who keeps the body of people living in darkness; of course noting here that we still use similar terminology in today's world for our leaders by referring to 'our eyes' as 'our visionaries', or 'those who see for a large group of people'. Also, it is important to understand with these verses that our religious leaders misinterpret 'a bad eye' as 'one that works, yet looks at or wants bad things'; with our religious leaders usually referencing drinking, drugs, pornography, etc. But they are wrong in that 'a bad eye' is 'one that does not work or can't see at all'; i.e., 'a bad eye' is blind and therefore represents 'blind religious leaders who lead their body of followers into a ditch' (Matthew 15.14). And so in these verses, the key to identifying that 'an eye = a person', not 'an actual eye' - and more specifically that 'the good Eye represents Jesus' - is to recognize that 'verses 30 and 33 are in fact parallel verses' where verse 30 is literal language and verse 33 is verse 30's parallel figurative verse.

<u>Verse 30</u> says "For as Jonah became <u>a sign</u> to the Ninevites, so also will the <u>Son of Man</u> be <u>a sign</u> to this generation".

<u>Verse 33</u> Says "No one, when he has <u>lit a lamp</u>, puts it under a basket, but <u>on a lampstand</u>, that those who come in (the room) may see <u>the light</u>".

Knowing that Jesus just said in verse 30 that '<u>He</u> (the <u>Light</u>) will be <u>a sign held up</u> for this generation to see', it becomes obvious that 'the <u>lit Lamp</u> put up <u>on a lampstand</u> in verse 33' <u>is in fact Jesus Himself</u>. Or,

<u>Jesus</u> = 'a <u>Sign</u> held up' (verse 30) = 'a <u>lit Lamp</u> on a lampstand' (verse 33).

Jesus then says in <u>verse 34</u>, "The <u>lamp</u> of <u>the body</u> is the <u>eye</u>. Therefore, when your <u>eye is **good**</u>, your <u>whole body</u> also is full of <u>light</u>. But when your <u>eye is **bad**</u>, your <u>body</u> also is full of <u>darkness</u>." Here Jesus is making the <u>parallel</u> (between verses 33 and 34) that 'a <u>working or **lit lamp**</u> will bring <u>light</u> into a room' just as 'a <u>good eye</u> that can <u>see</u> will bring <u>light</u> into a body', and 'a <u>non-working or **non-lit lamp**</u> will keep a room in <u>darkness</u>' just as 'a <u>bad eye</u> that is <u>blind</u> will keep a body in <u>darkness</u>'. Or,

'a working or <u>lit lamp'</u> = 'a good, <u>seeing eye'</u> and 'a non-working or <u>non-lit lamp'</u> = 'a bad, <u>blind eye'</u>.

Therefore, since '<u>Jesus</u> = <u>a lit Lamp'</u> (from verses 30&33), then '<u>Jesus</u> = <u>the qood, seeing Eye'</u>.

So again, if 'The Pharisees and Scribes are **blind** bad eyes that lead the whole body (both themselves and the multitudes) into a ditch' (Matthew 15.14, and they 'put light under a basket' or 'keep knowledge hidden' (see Luke 11.52) thereby keeping the body of people as if 'walking blind in a dark room', then it becomes quite obvious in verse 34 that 'the blind bad eye that keeps the whole body of people (the leaders + the multitudes) in darkness' represents 'the religious leaders', and 'the good Eye

that keeps the whole body of people in <u>light</u>' represents '<u>Jesus'</u>; noting that, in verse 35 Jesus is alluding to the fact that 'the religious leaders (just like Satan) disquise their darkness (i.e., false light) as light, and their blindness as sight'... of courses truly believing (because they have been tricked by Satan) that 'it is light and they do have sight'. Furthermore, if you don't believe that 'the blind bad eye' here represents the religious leaders, then consider that, in Luke 11.39-52, immediately following Luke 33-36, Jesus delivers '13 verses of woes and curses' to the Pharisees and Scribes; further enforcing that they are in fact 'blind bad eyes'. So because our religious leaders are just like the religious leaders of Jesus' day, we must realize that they **too** are 'blind bad eyes', keeping us, the body of people, 'in total darkness', as they have not only grossly misinterpreted these preceding passages - having no idea that Matthew 5.27-30 and Luke 11.33-36 were spoken by Christ to actually oppose them - but have also violated the New Covenant by teaching us their misinterpretations and error, feeding us their poisonous fruit of false knowledge. Now of course, in addition to defiling Christ's (and God's) true persona and intentions by teaching us 'their warped doctrine based on pathetically wrong biblical interpretations', our blind bad eyes have projected unrighteous sexual guilt and shame on individuals, restricting their personal freedom and liberty, and placing them in spiritual bondage, while <u>simultaneously</u> <u>negating</u>, and even glorifying their <u>real</u> macro level sin of <u>idolatry</u> and <u>total disregard</u> for the New Covenant that Christ died for. That is, the real macro level sin (which they should feel great guilt and shame about) of our blind bad eyes is 'teaching us many false personas of God and Jesus (i.e., false gods)' which <u>causes</u> both <u>A)</u> the <u>sexual desolation</u> of the multitudes, and <u>B)</u> the dividing into, and the forming of mobs, who blindly fight and kill to defend Satan's false gods, all leading to (on both spiritual and physical levels) the desolation, destruction, and enslavement of **humanity**... which is most definitely 'total darkness within the entire body of people'. Thus, in order to <u>see</u> and realize the <u>true New Covenant</u> that is 'hidden in plain sight by the total darkness caused by our blind bad eyes', we must 'pluck out our blind bad eyes' and accept Christ, 'the good Eye', when He returns, thereby bringing <u>light</u> into the entire body (of people), and finally *realizing* the **freedom** and **liberty** of the New Covenant that God intended all along.

As you can see, by our **blind bad eyes** <u>misinterpreting</u> the preceding verses, then <u>teaching</u> those false interpretations (i.e., <u>false knowledge</u>, <u>lies</u>, <u>error</u>, etc.) to the multitudes, they in fact <u>cause</u> 'widespread desolation (both <u>spiritual</u> and <u>physical</u>) and <u>darkness</u> in the entire body of people'; again why 'teaching others about God' is a <u>blatant violation</u> of the <u>New Covenant</u>, as it ultimately ends in 'teaching others a <u>false persona</u> of God', which is a <u>violation</u> of the <u>Primary Commandment</u>. But just like Adam and Eve, who were <u>tricked</u> by Satan into being <u>Satan-like</u>, while <u>thinking</u> that they were being <u>God-like</u>, we must realize that our religious leaders (being <u>blind</u> just like Adam and Eve) 'violate the New Covenant and keep the whole body in <u>darkness</u>' while <u>truly believing</u> that they 'uphold the New Covenant and keep the whole body in <u>light</u>'. This is of course why Jesus says "Take heed that the <u>light</u> which is in you is not <u>darkness</u>" (Luke 11.35). I.e., 'Make sure that you are not <u>tricked</u> by Satan into <u>thinking</u> (because of <u>name association</u> with Jesus and the true Prophets) that the body of people is <u>full of light</u>, while it is <u>really full of darkness</u>'; remembering here that the <u>Pharisees</u>, Scribes, Chief Priests, etc. thought that they were

full of <u>light</u>, while they were *really* full of <u>darkness</u>, as Satan, 'the angel of false light' (2 Corinthians 11.14), made 'darkness look like light', 'wrong look like right', 'quilt look like innocence', and vice versa. And so it cannot be stressed enough how Satan can <u>redefine</u> 'who God is' by tricking religious leaders into misinterpreting the Bible, and then teaching those misinterpretations to multitudes of people; who of course then pass those misinterpretations on to future generations, ultimately equating to infinite error that causes senseless 'division, war, and hate', which eventually leads to 'total darkness in the entire body of people'. And this is again the entire premise for God instituting the New Covenant, thereby having us 'not teach others about God': so that we would not compound error On top of *error*, creating seemingly **endless** *error* over **endless** *generations*, leading to **endless desolation**... as we now see in today's world. Hence, as Satan has essentially, through his blind ministers, used the Bible against us for thousands of years, the New Covenant was sealed, not to do away with the Bible (as it is **crucial historical information** concerning the acts of idolatrous men), but to assure us that 'there is nothing written in the Bible that is not already written on our hearts' - understanding that our minds must not be corrupted by Satan's false covenants in order to truly recognize 'what is written on our hearts' - thereby doing away with all of the false teachers (i.e., false mediators, false prophets, etc.) who, claiming to be a necessary 'divine connection', teach (for their own glory) 'error in the name of God' that causes immeasurable desolation and a body of people who live in total darkness; of course realizing that they do all of this while truly believing (just as the Scribes and Pharisees) that they 'teach the truth and bring light into the body'.

Therefore we must know that the **true Good News** of the **true New Covenant** is **'the end of**

religion' and all of its associated false mediators (i.e., wise men, magicians, sorcerers, soothsayers, mediums, intercessors, etc.) who perform supposedly necessary religious deeds and rituals (i.e., normalized magic, witchcraft, and sorcery) by which they create and teach 'error in the name of God' that causes untold amounts of (both micro and macro) 'division, war, and hate'; noting that this (i.e., 'the end of religion') is 'the <u>true</u> Good News preached to all the nations at the End of the Age' (see Matthew 24.14). We must know that the **true** Good News of the **true** New Covenant is 'the abolishment of religion', as it causes - by the forming of blind mobs who insist that 'they know God better than everyone else', and that 'they are the only ones receiving salvation through their mob' - the **supremacy** and **exclusion** that are 'the seeds of division, war, and hate'. So we must know that the true Good News of the true New Covenant (i.e., the culminating message of all the Prophets, and what **Christ died for**) is God's <u>secret plan</u> (Amos 3.7) for *unity, peace, and love*... leading of course to ultimate personal *freedom* and *liberty*. Yet we must <u>also</u> know that the people we have trusted, our religious leaders (i.e., our blind bad eyes), have, out of blind lust for control, power, authority, supremacy, glory, etc., ignored the **New Covenant**, thereby causing humanity to never realize the peace and freedom that is rightfully theirs under the New Covenant, and making humanity blindly fight and kill each other for essentially no reason at all; which God has allowed in order to show

humanity that it would destroy itself and the natural world (i.e., rivers, animals, forests, oceans, etc.) without accepting Him and Christ. That is, the wars, plagues, and division of the last 2000 years, which Christ talked about in Matthew 24.6-8, is to show us the repercussions of rejecting the true Christ and the true New Covenant. Hence we must know that, our religious leaders have acted as 'false mediators between us and Christ (the sole Mediator)' - as if He (or we) needed them - thereby obscuring the Simplicity of the New Covenant with their convoluted false wisdom (of course eaten from Satan's tree of false knowledge). That is, they have *supported* and *justified* their 'violations of the New Covenant' with 'the New Covenant itself', saying - with their beautifully crafted lies and false wisdom, and wonderfully deceitful double tongues - things like: A) 'Yes, God's laws are written on your heart so that **no one** has to teach you, yet we are here purely to **help you** (noting that we should say to this 'do me a favor, don't do me any favors') find out what's written on your heart (knowing that they have **instilled** their **false covenant** in your heart <u>already</u>) so you can <u>know God</u> more easily, having a <u>deeper understanding</u> of God, and a <u>deeper relationship</u> with God', and <u>B</u>) 'Yes, <u>no one</u> has to teach you, **after** we teach you'. But we must remember that 'God knows the thoughts of the wise, that they are futile, and so He catches the wise in their own Craftiness' (1 Corinthians 3.19&20). So because of these <u>crafty lies</u>, spoken from behind 'the <u>name</u> of <u>Jesus</u> and the <u>name</u> of the <u>New Covenant</u>', we live in Satan's darkness that 'hides the true New Covenant in plain sight', and right before our very eyes, thereby not realizing the **freedom** and **liberty** that God granted us so long ago. And we must therefore realize that the <u>lies</u> spoken about Jesus and the New Covenant by our religious leaders [in the interest of effectively creating 'a false Jesus' in order to 'control the past' (or 'keep us ignorant of the TRUE past'), thereby 'controlling the future'] originated from, and were spoken from behind 'the most <u>deceptive IdOI</u> the world has ever known', as this false idoI is itself named 'Jesus'... yet be assured that it (i.e., 'the Eucharist' created by our Catholic Forefathers) is not Jesus, but rather Satan in disguise.

3. The Eucharist: Source of Division, War, and Hate

What would you say if you were told that 'The fundamental, core doctrine of the Catholic religion can be <u>disproven</u>'? That is, <u>Catholicism</u>, and consequently <u>Christianity</u>, is <u>not 'of Christ'</u>, but rather '<u>of men</u> who blindly opposed (and still oppose) everything the true Christ stood for', making them 'anti-Christ', and their doctrine actually 'false doctrine taken from Satan's tree of false knowledge'. Most devout Catholics (being programmed from childhood by the false teachers of Catholicism) will respond to this by saying 'That's impossible, the Catholic Church (i.e., its core doctrine) is infallible'. These devout Catholics must therefore be reminded that the Jews of Jesus' day were <u>also</u> taught (by words spoken from behind the <u>name</u> of **God**) to believe that 'Judaism's doctrine was <u>infallible</u>'. And so 'a devout Catholic in today's world' must ask themselves, 'If I were a devout Pharisee Jew 2000 years ago, Would I believe an uneducated Carpenter who opposed my entire Jewish religion, saying Judaism and its leaders were all blindly following Satan?' Odds are that most devout Catholics will respond to opposition against the Catholic religion the same way most Pharisee Jews responded to Jesus' opposition against the Jewish religion 2000 years ago... with total and utter disbelief. You must realize that the Pharisees and Teachers of the Law (and probably most of the Jewish elders) thought that the Messiah would approve of their religious practices. So, because Jesus did not approve of their religion, they reasoned that it was impossible for Him to truly be the Son of God; of course then rejecting Him. Now in today's world - with us also thinking that the Messiah will return and approve of our religious practices (remembering from Section 1 that 'Jesus came to abolish religion') - this means that a devout Catholic must ask themselves, 'If Jesus were to show up today and oppose Catholicism, would I accept Him as the true Son of God and the true Messiah? Or, would I, just as they did 2000 years ago, reject Jesus, reasoning that He must be from Satan (i.e., that He is a false messiah), therefore wanting Him to be executed... all while believing that I am serving and honoring God (John 16.2)?' Hence, Catholicism/Christianity must ultimately face the harsh reality that 'they are in the same position as Judaism was 2000 years ago', thinking that they are <u>infallible</u> and incapable of falling into (macro) <u>error</u>, while actually being extremely *fallible*, and blindly following Satan... all because 'the *lies* and *error* they *think* is *infallible* truth' has been spoken in 'the name of Christ', and from behind 'a false idol (i.e., the Eucharist) named Jesus'. And this means that, as Jesus' sole purpose was, and still is, 'to abolish religion' (as it represents 'the well disguised false doctrine of Satan'), He will (upon returning) of course very much oppose <u>Catholicism</u> - just as He opposed *Judaism* 2000 years ago - as they are the ones <u>responsible</u> for creating and propagating the *lies* about Jesus (spoken from behind 'the **Eucharist** and the name of Christ') which, being perceived as infallible truth, have led to the world following 'a false persona of Jesus', and consequently many false qods; ultimately meaning that they (specifically the Catholic hierarchy and their forefathers), regardless of how many times they use 'the name of Christ' (thereby thinking they are infallible), are actually 'anti-Christ'. Therefore, this entire text is evidence brought against <u>Catholicism</u> (and <u>all</u> other religions on earth that exist, either *directly* or *indirectly* because of Catholicism) that proves their fallibility, and also serves as both an indictment (i.e., 'the presenting of formal charges' as foretold in Jeremiah 2.9&35) and guilty verdict for crimes against humanity which have been committed while <u>hiding behind</u> the <u>innocence</u> associated with the <u>names</u> of **Christ** and

God. And this <u>evidence</u>, which in fact <u>disproves</u> Catholicism's *fundamental*, *core doctrine*, is presented so that <u>all people</u> (whether *Catholic*, *Protestant*, *Jew*, *Muslim*, *etc*.) may, contrary to 2000 years ago, <u>truly accept</u>, <u>recognize</u>, and <u>believe in</u> Jesus, the <u>true Messiah</u>, when He does return, even if at first it <u>seems</u> to be (because of being <u>born into</u> '*lies* disguised as <u>infallible truth</u>') 'the <u>most unbelievable</u> <u>thing</u> you have ever heard'; realizing that 'the <u>end</u> of Jewish religious deeds and sacrifices' was 'the most unbelievable thing the Jews of 2000 years ago had never heard'.

No matter how many times the Catholic hierarchy, in reverent blasphemy, honors 'the names of Christ and God', the simple fact is that they (and their forefathers) are both anti-Christ and anti-God because they are **guilty** of blatantly **breaking** God's **1**st and **2**nd **Commandments** (which consequently breaks the other Commandments), thereby <u>causing</u>, in the name of Christ, 'untold physical and spiritual <u>desolation</u>', and ultimately <u>defiling</u> '<u>everything that is sacred</u> to Christ and God'. To further explain, sometime in the mid-second century (150 AD) the Catholic Forefathers (of course first breaking the 2nd Commandment) broke the 1st Commandment and created what we now recognize as the **Eucharist**. The **Eucharist** is 'bread and wine that has, through a false miracle called transubstantiation (which is actually just the act of speaking spiritual spells over the bread and wine), Supposedly (according to Catholic doctrine) become the actual body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ'. But, as further explained in this text (see Sections 7&8), the 'bread and wine' (usually symbolized with just 'the bread') is not Jesus, nor does it contain the life force, Spirit, essence, etc. of Christ (i.e., it cannot breathe, walk, or talk), thereby making the Eucharist 'a figment of the imaginations of men', which, in the end, is simply just 'a piece of bread that has no meaning whatsoever'. To clarify, 'the <u>loaf of bread</u> at the <u>Last Supper</u>' did have a <u>purely symbolic meaning</u> (see Section 8), yet since Catholicism's Eucharist has a totally different and defiled meaning (i.e., one of hidden oppression and slavery) than that of 'the loaf of bread at the Last Supper' - thereby being totally <u>unrelated</u> (or just related in <u>name association only</u>) - it can therefore be said that the <u>Eucharist</u> is in fact meaningless in regards to 'having anything to do with the true Christ or His true intentions'. And so the Eucharist is Catholicism's false idol that they have deceitfully named 'Jesus' in order to fool and <u>deceive</u> people with 'a <u>name</u> of past righteousness', with the **motive** of obtaining **absolute power**. That is, by <u>naming</u> their '<u>un</u>righteous false idol' with 'a <u>righteous</u> name (i.e., Jesus)', and then <u>speaking</u> lies from behind 'what people believe is actually Jesus', the Catholic hierarchy gained (and still has) the unique ability to <u>fabricate</u> (for their own glory, supremacy, power, and control) 'man-made laws that are <u>disquised</u> as God's laws', thereby making multitudes of people 'bow to them and <u>their will</u>' (enslaving the multitudes to themselves) while truly believing that they are 'bowing to Christ's will'; which, being 'the well disguised worship of man', ultimately causes, between both individuals and nations, unrighteous dissension, judgment, exclusion, oppression, and supremacy, leading to torture, murder, starvation, homelessness, hopelessness, and overall desolation (i.e., 'division, war, and hate') in both physical and spiritual realms. This consequently means that the Eucharist is the greatest and most deceptive false idol ever known to mankind, and 'the idol (or abomination) that causes worldwide <u>desolation</u>' (Matthew 24.15). Now we must realize that, if Catholicism's <u>lies</u> (or their

doctrine) are **justified** because 'people truly believe that they were essentially spoken by Christ' (being spoken from behind the Eucharist by the Pope, Christ's supposed Vicar), then, in people's minds, Catholicism's lies appear to be infallible truth. And these 'lies that people think are truth' (or 'figurative dirt' from Section 1) is what has kept, for so long, 'the source (or root) of division, war, and hate' (i.e., the Eucharist) covered, hidden, and unseen, and therefore well fed and nourished. That is, the Eucharist is 'the root of the tree of division, war, and hate', and it is 'the lies spoken from behind the Eucharist' that is 'the figurative <u>dirt</u>' keeping this root <u>nourished</u>, and keeping it from being <u>exposed</u>. This consequently means that 'worldwide division, war, and hate' is kept alive and flourishing, just as a tree (with its root hidden and nourished by dirt) is kept alive and flourishing. So we must realize that, by breaking the 1st Commandment with 'the institution of a false image of Jesus, named the Eucharist', the Catholic hierarchy (specifically the Catholic Forefathers) could then, breaking the 2nd Commandment, easily speak words and man-made doctrine (i.e., lies) from behind the Eucharist that Jesus **never** spoke, with these *lies* (without us even knowing it) keeping the Eucharist (i.e., the source or root) alive, thereby consequently (again, without us even knowing it) keeping 'worldwide division, war, and hate' alive, as the Eucharist represents 'Catholicism's doctrine of supremacy and exclusion' which has been 'the **breeding ground** for division, war, and hate'. Thus, the **Eucharist** is 'the false image (or idol) of <u>Jesus'</u> from behind which the Catholic hierarchy has Caused (many times blindly and unknowingly) widespread 'division, war, and hate' (which are 'the products and consequences of violating God's Primary Commandment'), making the **Eucharist** the **hidden** and **unseen** 'source of division, war, and hate' (in both physical and spiritual realms); noting here that this 'source' or 'root' feeds many <u>branches</u> that we fail to see as being related, yet they <u>all</u> can be <u>traced back</u> to 'one common source or root'. And the Catholic hierarchy has justified their actions of enslavement, oppression, murder, extortion, and torture by fabricating, from behind the Eucharist, 'man-made laws which <u>validate their crimes'</u>, essentially <u>justifying</u> 'what is <u>anti-Christ</u>' with 'the name and a false image of Christ' (i.e., stealing a good name and assigning to it 'what is evil' in order to fool people with names), thereby literally 'getting away with murder' by hiding behind and becoming seamless with 'the good and innocent name of Jesus'... of course making us (and their own warped minds) think that they are innocent, while they are very much guilty.

With the <u>Eucharist</u>, the Catholic Church has made itself <u>inseparable</u> from 'the <u>name</u> of Jesus' - even <u>identifying 'their church'</u> as Jesus - thereby setting up <u>Satan's perfect 'puppet Jesus'</u> from behind which he can <u>rule the nations</u> without <u>anyone even knowing</u> that it is really him (i.e., Satan)... whispering into the Catholic hierarchy's ear while <u>impersonating Jesus</u>. As Revelation 12.9 and 13.3,4,&15 says, 'Satan <u>deceives the whole world</u> and gets them to <u>worship him</u> by using <u>both</u> the Catholic Church (i.e., the Beast) and the Eucharist (i.e., the Image of the Beast) as his <u>puppets</u>'. That is, by <u>both</u> the <u>Eucharist</u> (i.e., the Image of the Beast) and the <u>Catholic Church</u> (i.e., the Beast) being <u>identified</u> as 'being Jesus', Satan - through his blind Catholic hierarchy who repeat, as <u>parrots</u>, what he whispers in their ear - is able to <u>speak from behind</u> both the <u>Eucharist</u> and the <u>Catholic Church</u>, using them as his 'puppet Jesus' so that the whole world bows to Satan's laws, <u>thinking</u> that they are Jesus' laws, thereby <u>tricking</u> and <u>deceiving</u> the multitudes into 'unknowingly worshiping and serving Satan

(i.e., the **Dragon**)'... which will ultimately lead to humanity blindly **destroying** itself. So remembering that 'Satan is the first and original identity thief', we must realize that Satan will assume any and all identities that advance his agenda of 'division, war, and hate', disguising himself as anything, any institution, or anyone that is perceived as good and righteous. And since we perceive 'Jesus and anything associated with Jesus' as being good and righteous, Satan has of course disguised himself as Jesus 'in the Eucharist' (i.e., the loaf or piece of bread associated with the Last Supper), as well as disguising himself as Jesus 'in the Catholic institution itself' (i.e., the Catholic hierarchy even identifies 'their church itself' as 'being Jesus'); remembering here that 'Satan (in the desert) disquised his voice as **God's voice**' in an attempt to deceive and trick Jesus into **unknowingly** doing his will. So Satan's deceptions clearly have no boundaries (realizing that Satan will even call himself 'Jesus' right in front of Jesus Himself), and he is an expert, beyond what our human minds want to believe, at deceiving <u>unsuspecting victims</u> by '<u>disquising</u> what is <u>evil</u> or <u>bad</u> as being something <u>good</u>'. As an example of '<u>disquising</u> something <u>bad</u> as something <u>good</u> in order to <u>deceive</u> people', consider the **Trojan Horse**. If we as humans can devise a scheme using a <u>Trojan Horse</u>, essentially tricking an <u>unsuspecting victim</u> into openly accepting 'what will lead to their death and destruction' because it (i.e., the Trojan Horse with the **enemy** hiding inside) has been **disguised** as 'a **qift** from a **friend**', then surely Satan (the Enemy) is also capable of devising similar schemes, fooling us into openly accepting, housing, and harboring his 'means of destroying us' (i.e., the Eucharist), disguising the Eucharist as 'a qift from Jesus, our Friend'... while in reality Satan, the Enemy, is 'hiding inside' of the Eucharist. Note also here the parallel that the **Trojan Horse** was 'sold' to the Trojans as being 'an offering to the goddess Athena', just like the **Eucharist** has been 'sold to an unsuspecting multitude of victims' as being 'an offering to God'. So just as the Greeks used (i.e., 'hid inside of') a <u>Trojan Horse</u> (realizing that 'a <u>horse</u>' was a symbol of Troy itself) to *deceive*, disguising 'a means of destruction' as 'a means of pleasing **Athena**', Satan has used (i.e., 'hidden inside of') the Eucharist to deceive the multitudes, disguising his 'means of destroying humanity' as 'a means of pleasing God'; understanding that the lies spoken by Satan's Catholic hierarchy from behind the Eucharist and the Catholic institution itself (both of which are Satan's puppets) cause the 'division, war, and hate' that destroys humanity. Therefore, just as the Trojan Horse was 'something <u>bad</u> <u>disquised as</u> something <u>good</u>' that was used to <u>deceive</u> <u>unsuspecting victims</u>, so too will **Satan** (i.e., 'the <u>bad</u>') <u>disquise</u> himself as '<u>anything</u>, <u>any institution</u>, or <u>anyone</u> that is perceived as good' (i.e., a piece of bread used at the Last Supper, Jesus' supposed church, Jesus Himself, God Himself, Mary, Peter, etc.) to *deceive* his <u>unsuspecting victims</u>. So as <u>inseparable</u> as 'the Eucharist and the Catholic Church itself' have become in many people's minds with 'the name of Jesus', we must know that the Eucharist and the Catholic Church itself are not Jesus, but rather Satan disguised as Jesus, with Satan assuming those identities, then watching and laughing at our propensity to worship 'anything man-made (namely the <u>Eucharist</u>) that has the <u>name of Jesus</u> attached to it', thereby being <u>easily</u> <u>deceived</u> into <u>unknowingly</u> worshipping <u>Satan</u>. And by <u>openly accepting</u> 'Satan <u>disquised as</u> Jesus' we have essentially 'openly accepted and allowed into our figurative city walls the greatest *Trojan horse ever created'*: the **Eucharist**. As a side note, it is important to realize that, as the Eucharist represents 'Satan's (i.e., Catholicism's) doctrine disguised as Jesus' doctrine', by us

'Remembering the Eucharist' (as Catholicism says is per Luke 22.19), we are really unknowingly 'Remembering the false doctrine created by the Catholic Forefathers which has been spoken in the name of Christ', thereby not 'Remembering the true Christ' at all, but rather 'the Catholic Forefather's false persona of Christ (i.e., Satan) which resembles themselves'; with the ultimate understanding that, as Satan disguises himself as Jesus in the spiritual realm, no one - outside of the people Jesus actually knew while He physically walked among us 2000 years ago - can actually 'Remember the real Jesus'.

Now many devout Catholics will claim that they are 'open-minded, progressive freethinkers'. But this the idea that 'the <u>Eucharist</u> (and of course the Catholic Church itself) is essentially <u>Satan disguised</u> as <u>Jesus'</u> - is something they **cannot** possibly 'open their mind to', thereby showing that their 'thinking' is only free until it reaches the man-made boundaries set up the Catholic hierarchy. And we must ultimately recognize that 'fear of opposing Catholicism' - which the Catholic hierarchy has instilled in many from such a young age, as if they are one in same with Christ - is the reason Why many cannot cross these boundaries, thereby actually staying 'closed-minded'. Remember that Jesus revealed unknown truth and knowledge (think of the world being round, not flat) to the Jewish people 2000 years ago, and they were **afraid** because it **opposed Judaism**; realizing that, 'to oppose Judaism' was wrongly perceived as also opposing God. So if we are to cross the fallible, man-made limits and boundaries that we have inherited from our religious forefathers, truly being 'free in our thinking', we must not 'fear the truth' (see John 8.32), as they did 2000 years ago, just because it is knowledge that is unknown or unfamiliar to us. I.e., 'don't fear the unknown', as it just may be Jesus that you are fearing. We must therefore recognize that 'the unrighteous, man-made fear which the Catholic hierarchy projects deep into our subconscious minds' is based on nothing more than 'a smokescreen of lies fabricated from the mind of Satan'. And these lies keep humanity ignorant of 'the true knowledge of Christ' in an attempt to divide, enslave, and destroy all of humanity. Thus, we must realize that *all of humanity has been deceived* (Revelation 12.9) by 'the false prophets and false teachers of the Catholic Church', and we will never know the real truth (or real freedom) if we are not willing to 'open the door in our minds when the **truth knocks'**, crossing 'the threshold of unrighteous, man-made fear'. So be assured that this (i.e., this entire text) is the truth and knowledge of Jesus Christ that directly opposes Catholicism, and thereby exposes the deceptive lies and error (fabricated by the Catholic Forefathers and compounded by their descendants) that keeps all of humanity in <u>darkness</u>; as these lies (i.e., dirt) keep 'the <u>source</u> of division, war, and hate' <u>covered over</u> (as with 'dirt'). And this truth and knowledge is 'the ark of God's salvation for the coming flood (i.e., the Great Tribulation)' to all who 'hear and believe'.

The New Covenant states that 'No one shall teach their friends or tell their neighbors about the Lord' (Hebrews 8.11) because 'everyone from the least to the greatest' 'will be taught by God' (John 6.45). And the New Covenant specifies that 'no one shall teach their neighbor about God' in order to minimize and eliminate error regarding 'the true persona of God'. Error regarding God's true persona can

magnify and 'Snowball' when passed down through generations, which means that the enormous error (i.e., their tradition of inherited lies) that we see in the Catholic Church today is the result of almost 2000 years of false, anti-Christ doctrine that has been taught and then passed down as 'pro-Christ' truth; 'snowballing' and magnifying from one generation to the next. So in other words, the enormous error that we see in the Catholic Church today is the **result** of **2000 years** of **breaking** the New Covenant, as the Catholic Forefathers **not only** broke God's Primary Commandment, but then **taught** that error to the next generation, perpetuating and propagating 'lies in the names of Christ and God'. So by **breaking God's Primary Commandment** (i.e., the 1st and 2nd Commandments), and then **also** disregarding the New Covenant, the Catholic Forefathers and subsequent Catholic descendants thereby taught their error to following generations, hence producing many generations that have been, and still are *oblivious* to the fact that they are *breaking* God's Primary Commandment, as Well as *breaking* the New Covenant. Thus it is important to realize that the error (i.e., the Eucharist and the lies surrounding it) started by the Catholic Forefathers is blindly **propagated** by the Catholic hierarchy's ignorance of the true New Covenant. And the fact is that, because the Catholic hierarchy has been deceived (with crafty redefining of the New Covenant) by 'the false teachers and false prophets who came before them', they continue to blindly teach the multitudes finely crafted lies, repeating over and over again, as 'Satan's parrots', the error of their sacred tradition (i.e., 'folklore'); realizing here that, if you repeat a lie enough times, over many generations, it becomes infallible truth in people's minds in the <u>future</u>, as it no doubt turns into <u>'legend'</u>. Also note that, while the Catholic hierarchy may think that they are infallible because they believe 'the Holy Spirit is quiding them', the fact is that it is **Satan's Spirit of Error** who corrupted the Catholic Forefathers and tricked them into breaking the New Covenant, thereby passing down their corruption and error to blind future generations; of course meaning that it is still Satan's Spirit of Error that is guiding the blind leaders of Catholicism, having them **continue** to **teach** their **fallible**, **false knowledge** to the next generation, thereby blindly leading the multitudes into 'a hell that Satan has disguised as heaven' (Matthew 15.14). So while it is bad enough that the Catholic hierarchy has broken God's Primary Commandment (or Law), by them <u>also</u> disregarding and rejecting the <u>true New Covenant</u> (of course nullifying the <u>very reason</u> for Christ's death) they have propagated their lawlessness, making it actually magnify and snowball from one generation to the next, and even redefining their lawlessness (specifically doctrine concerning the **Eucharist**) in the minds of future generations into 'the stuff of **legends**'... while it is really 'the stuff of <u>lawbreakers</u>', although the Catholic Church now (erroneously) recognizes 'their lawbreakers' (people they <u>never</u> actually <u>knew</u>) as 'Saints' in order 'to <u>glorify</u> their institution and further <u>confuse</u> the multitudes'.

Now with the **Eucharist** being used for many generations by the Catholic hierarchy to blindly teach their lies and error concerning Christ - <u>teaching lies about Jesus from behind 'a false Jesus'</u> - we, in today's world, have of course received a <u>twisted</u>, and <u>warped version</u> of <u>Christ</u>. That is, because of the <u>lies</u> and <u>error spoken</u> and <u>propagated</u> by the Catholic hierarchy of past generations from <u>behind</u> the **Eucharist**, the entire world has **inherited** 'a **false persona** of **Jesus**', resulting in multitudes of

people who have <u>never known</u> the <u>real Jesus</u> (and consequently the <u>one true God</u>)... or Jesus' <u>true</u> intentions of 'equality, inclusion, freedom, and liberty'. Hence we must all realize that it is only through the Catholic Church that the entire world 'knows' Jesus; and 'the persona of the Catholic Church's Jesus' is not 'the persona of the real Jesus'. Think about it. Even 'Christmas' is a Catholic tradition, as the name Christmas (i.e., Christ Mass) implies a Catholic Mass 'supposedly' dedicated to *honoring Christ*; although it is secretly dedicated to *honoring themselves*. So regardless of your religion, or **no** religion, if you don't understand Catholicism, then you don't understand the error that you have inherited. The lies and error that we have inherited from the Catholic Church - concerning 'the **personas** and **intentions** of both Jesus and God' and 'the <u>disregard</u> of God's Primary Commandment and the New Covenant' - have <u>led to</u> the <u>religious division</u> that we see today, with many other religions 'following in the footsteps of Catholicism', blatantly breaking God's Primary Commandment and the New Covenant. To further explain, by creating a false idol (i.e., the Eucharist), and insisting that 'All who do not worship our false idol (which is really them, being the **only ones** capable of **making** the Eucharist) will be **condemned** to eternal damnation', Catholicism triggered a chain reaction of supremacy and exclusion; which of course breeds 'division, war, and hate'. That is, saying 'Salvation only comes to those who belong to an exclusive group, club, mob, etc.' makes people, who do not feel a part of, or agree with that exclusive group, 'divide off and form their own group'; of course at least subconsciously (in a person's heart) sensing that this 'exclusive group' is practicing, to some degree, the unspoken 'worship of man'. Now once this 'new group' - usually started and led by people who want to practice their own supremacy (i.e., idolatry) over others, having people 'worship them' - starts to believe that 'There is no salvation outside our new group' (of course breaking the Primary Commandment and the New Covenant), then <u>dissent</u> and <u>hate</u> leads to war between the two groups. Think about it. Is this not what happened with Islam, Judaism, and the Protestant religions who either 'split from' or 'would not concede to' Catholicism's false idol, the **Eucharist**? As a **parallel** in today's world, think of a **new** corporation that splits from a 'parent corporation', then eventually (once large enough) competes with the parent corporation. Can we not therefore see that this constant power struggle among corporations is the same power struggle that has been taking place among our religions for centuries? And so by setting the <u>example</u> of <u>A)</u> macro level, large scale *supremacy* and *exclusion*, and <u>B)</u> total <u>disregard</u> for God's Primary Commandment and the (true) New Covenant - essentially disseminating, propagating, and teaching these violations 'in the <u>name</u> of Christ and the New Covenant' - the Catholic Church ultimately triggered a chain reaction of religious division; i.e., the creation of many other religions, or false gods. Religious division is, and always has been, 'the root cause of war and hate among nations' as people will <u>blindly fight</u> to *protect* the <u>false god</u> (i.e., the religion) that they have been trained to <u>believe</u> is 'the <u>real God</u>'. Thus, if the religious division that we see today is a <u>product</u> of 'the Catholic Church's <u>lies</u> that have been spoken from behind the Eucharist', and religious division is 'the root cause' or 'source' of war and hate among groups and nations, then the **Eucharist** is our hidden 'source of division, war, and hate' - not 'unity, peace, and love'. To reiterate, in one line, Catholicism's redefined, false

persona of **Jesus**, spoken **from behind** the **Eucharist**, is the **cause** of **worldwide division**, and consequently the **cause** of **worldwide war** and **hate** among groups and nations.

Now knowing that the Eucharist is 'the <u>source</u> of <u>worldwide separation</u> and <u>division</u>', and is 'the greatest form of idolatry the world has ever seen', it must be reiterated that the reason the Eucharist has remained hidden and unidentified for more than 1850 years is, as mentioned in Section 1, the 'dirt' or 'lies' hiding and covering over this 'root' or 'source', as these lies are 'spoken in the name of Christ' so that no one can question them out of fear of opposing Christ. Remember also that 'the best lies are those <u>closest</u> to the <u>truth</u>'. So if 'Jesus <u>Himself</u> was and iS the truth', and 'the <u>Eucharist</u> is <u>thought</u> to be <u>Jesus</u>', then 'the <u>Eucharist itself</u> is quite possibly the best lie ever told', being propped up and supported by many other lies. Now, remembering that Jeremiah 16.19 says "Surely our fathers have inherited lies", in Catholicism these 'lies passed down from the Catholic Forefathers' (both the Eucharist and supporting lies) are referred to as their 'sacred tradition' (as outlined in the Catholic Catechism), with this tradition <u>superseding</u>, and thereby <u>opposing</u> and <u>defiling</u> 'what is written in the Bible' (although they will *claim* that their tradition complements, it does not supersede). That is, because the Catholic hierarchy is <u>blind</u> (being *vain*, *arrogant*, and *stiff-necked*), they <u>truly believe</u> that their sacred tradition is *complementing* the word of God, when in truth, their sacred tradition supersedes, opposes, and defiles the word of God; remembering here that the 1st page of the Bible details Adam and Eve being tempted with 'being God-like and in accordance with God', not realizing (due to Satan's 'redefined version of good and evil', and their own spiritual blindness) that they were actually being 'Satan-like and opposing God'. And so out of sheer blindness, the Catholic hierarchy (being a mere bloated continuation of 'the Jewish hierarchy of 2000 years ago') has done just as the Jewish leaders of Jesus' day, with Jesus saying to them in Mark 7.13 "You make the word of God of no effect (i.e., you supersede, oppose, and defile the word of God) **through your tradition** which you have handed down". Hence we must recognize that, regardless of a tradition being 'revered as something that honors God', if it breaks God's Commandments (especially the Primary Commandment), then it does **not honor** God, but rather **man**, and ultimately **Satan**. And this of course is why John says "He who says 'I know Jesus' and does not keep His Commandments, is a liar, and the truth is **not** in him" (1 John 2.4). In other words, 'The Catholic hierarchy may say (see Matthew 15.8) that they <u>honor</u> Christ with their <u>traditions</u> (such as the <u>Eucharist</u> and all of their <u>other inherited lies</u>), but since they **do not keep His Commandments** (making and worshipping a false idol and a false god) it <u>reveals</u> them as actually being <u>liars</u> (or <u>wolves</u> in sheep's clothing)'. Thus, by <u>simply</u> 'examining the Primary Commandment' and then 'comparing the Primary Commandment to Catholicism's sacred <u>tradition</u>', it easily 'tells on the Catholic hierarchy', as they break 'all 3 parts of the Primary Commandment', thereby showing that, as many times as they say 'We know Jesus', the fact is that 'they have <u>never known</u> Jesus'... but rather His <u>brother</u>, <u>Satan</u>, who has <u>disguised</u> himself <u>as Jesus</u>. And so just as Jesus said to the Jews - "Moses gave you the Law, but not One of you obeys the Law" (John 7.19) the <u>same</u> can also be said about the <u>Catholic Forefathers</u> and their <u>present day descendants</u>, with '<u>not</u>

<u>one</u> of them <u>obeying</u> God's Primary Commandment', and consequently '<u>not one</u> of them <u>knowing</u> Jesus'. In other words, by instituting the <u>Eucharist</u> and subsequent 'man-made laws of Catholicism' (remembering that 'a false, man-made belief system or <u>set of laws'</u> = 'a false god'), the Catholic hierarchy has <u>broken</u> (i.e., <u>not</u> obeyed) '<u>all 3 parts of the 1st and <u>Primary Commandment'</u> (i.e., 'The <u>Law</u> of Moses', Exodus 20.1-7); while of course <u>boldly claiming</u> (with a double tongue) to <u>teach</u> and <u>uphold</u> the <u>Commandments</u>, saying over and over again 'We <u>know</u> Jesus'. The following details how the Catholic hierarchy (of both <u>past</u> and <u>present</u>) has broken '<u>all</u> of the <u>3 parts</u> of God's Primary Commandment' (as outlined in <u>Section 1</u>).</u>

The **Catholic hierarchy** has:

- <u>1. established 'the beliefs, doctrine, and laws of Catholicism'</u> as a **false god**, and then served the **false god** 'Catholicism' before the one <u>true God</u>... of course then <u>teaching</u> the multitudes that 'You will <u>not be saved</u> without <u>first</u> bowing to and serving Catholicism, <u>before God</u>'.
- 2. made, served, and 'bowed down to' the Eucharist: an image or likeness of 'something (i.e., Jesus) in heaven'.
- 3. vainly and arrogantly taken (or stolen) the names of God and Jesus, thereby speaking lies from behind Their names and the Eucharist, consequently deceiving, for Satan, untold generations and multitudes of people into 'unknowingly hating the Christ and the God that they believed they loved'.

Therefore, by the Catholic hierarchy (specifically the Catholic Forefathers) committing the ultimate sin - i.e., 'taking or stealing God's name in vain', which is 'the <u>sin</u> that God will <u>not</u> hold him <u>quiltless</u> of' (Exodus 20.7), and 'the <u>sin</u> that will not be forgiven' (Luke 12.10) - they have subsequently <u>A</u>) spoken reverent blasphemy (corresponding to Part 3) in order to B) trick people into believing that 'God, who does not change (Malachi 3.6), has now somehow changed His mind, making it virtuous and God-like to worship an idol' (corresponding to Part 2), with C) the 'false doctrine and laws' spoken so reverently from behind this false idol (i.e., the Eucharist) then becoming the false god 'Catholicism' (corresponding to Part 1). Note here also that, although Catholicism worships their false idol (i.e., the Eucharist) as being a god, we must recognize that it is 'the set of man-made beliefs and laws' that is their true god, as without this 'set of man-made beliefs and laws', the Eucharist would cease to exist; ultimately meaning that the Eucharist is merely the **control** symbol or **control** image which makes people - triggering the unrighteous fear of God (as it is created by men) in people's minds - bow to the false god 'Catholicism'. And we must remember that, if Catholicism is 'a set of rules, laws, and beliefs that is from man, not God', then, by bowing to Catholicism, the multitudes are actually bowing to, worshiping, and honoring man, all while thinking that they are bowing to, worshiping, and honoring <u>God</u>... meaning that the multitudes are <u>unknowingly</u> practicing 'the well disquised Worship of **man**'. Now this of course is the basic principle that Catholicism has used throughout the centuries to guarantee their **control** and **power** over **nations** and **multitudes**. That is, Catholicism's basic principle for 'attaining **absolute power'** is to:

- A) create a false idol that people truly believe is God,
- <u>B)</u> speak <u>lies from behind</u> that idol, thereby redefining *God's persona* to be more like 'the persona of men (i.e., the Catholic hierarchy)', which
- <u>C)</u> makes people <u>yield</u> to the will of <u>man</u> (because they have been raised to <u>believe</u> that it is <u>also</u> the will of God), ultimately
- <u>D)</u> accomplishing for the <u>Catholic hierarchy</u> their (at least subconscious) goal of 'having the multitudes <u>enslaved</u> to them, with <u>absolute power</u> in the mental, emotional, spiritual, and (consequently) <u>physical</u> realms'.

So again, as you can see the <u>power</u> of 'speaking lies from behind a false idol', we must remember that the most deceptively <u>misleading</u> and <u>underestimated aspects</u> of a false idol is that 'we cannot fathom the lies spoken from behind a false idol', as we have been taught that 'those lies are really the truth'; recognizing that, it is not so much the idol itself that is a defilement to God (as if God is enraged by 'the mere sight of a statue or a piece of bread'), but rather 'the lies that have been spoken by men from behind the idol', as these lies redefine God's persona into a false god. Thus, by speaking reverently blasphemous lies from behind the Eucharist (a false idol), the Catholic hierarchy has instituted their own 'man-made laws and beliefs' - such as 'no salvation without the Catholic hierarchy' - which have become a false god before the one true God, thereby breaking 'all 3 parts of God's Primary Commandment'. And by committing these idolatrous acts, the Catholic hierarchy has subsequently tricked multitudes of people (creating macro level supremacy and exclusion in their minds) into defending and fighting wars for a false god (which actually equates to 'blindly defending the Catholic hierarchy's hidden kingship'), while thinking that they are defending and fighting wars for God and Jesus</u>, thereby making the Catholic hierarchy, and all other religious hierarchies practicing these same 'methods of deception', guilty of causing 'the desolation of humanity'.

Now since A) the Eucharist is a false idol, which was commonly referred to in the Old Testament as an abomination, and B) the Eucharist (and the magnitude of lies spoken from behind the Eucharist) is the root cause of 'the desolation of humanity', then quite simply 'the Eucharist' = 'the Abomination of Desolation' (from Daniel 11.31, and mentioned by Jesus in Matthew 24.15), as the Eucharist is responsible (whether directly or indirectly) for much of the bloodshed, oppression, slavery, starvation, homelessness, and hopelessness (both spiritual and physical) over the past 2000 years. And so the Eucharist is not 'sacred bread', but rather 'defiled bread' that has either directly or indirectly infiltrated - in the form of lies spoken about Jesus from behind the Eucharist - every aspect of our society; whether it is direct, as in people (both individuals and nations) fighting and hating others over 'who they think of Jesus is' and 'who should receive salvation', or indirect, as in the example of supremacy and enslavement set by Catholicism that has leached into our brains like a disease, causing widespread lust for money and power at the expense of our health, happiness, and freedom (remembering that normalized slavery still exists in 'free nations', it is just hidden by beautifully deceptive language). So again, the Eucharist is 'the false idol that has caused worldwide desolation', and

is therefore, as Jesus says in Matthew 24.15, 'the <u>Abomination of Desolation</u> that is <u>standing</u> in the <u>holy</u> <u>place</u> (or up on the <u>altar</u> so that we <u>think</u> it is <u>sacred</u>, <u>holy bread</u>)'. The Abomination of Desolation is discussed further in detail in **Section 5.1**.

It must also be mentioned here that the **Eucharist** is **'the Image of the Beast'** prophesied by John in Revelation. As discussed further in **Section 5.2**, the Catholic Church (and the religions that exist either <u>directly</u> or <u>indirectly</u> because of their influence) is 'the Beast' in Revelation that deceives the whole world. So if we can concede that the **Eucharist** is 'the single defining image of the **Catholic** Church', and the Catholic Church is 'the Beast', then the Eucharist is therefore 'the Image of the Beast'. I.e., 'the Image of the Beast' is a false idol that represents the false god that is 'the Catholic religion'. Here it must be noted that, the 'smoking qun', so to speak, which points to this fact is that Revelation 13.15 says 'the Image of the Beast has **life breathed into it by the false prophet** (who is the Pope)'. Think about it. The Catholic Church, led by the Pope or *false prophet*, is the **only** institution on earth that 'claims to **breathe life** into an image'. I.e., by 'the act of transubstantiation', the Catholic hierarchy claims that they can 'breathe the life force of Christ (body, blood, soul, and divinity) into an image', which happens to be a piece (or loaf) of bread. But you must remember that, just like any false image of God (or any god), the <u>Eucharist does **not**</u> have the **breath** of God's Spirit (Genesis 2.7), so it is <u>dead</u>. That is, at best, the Eucharist is **dead flesh** because it cannot breathe, walk, or talk as only the living, breathing Christ 'walked, talked, and dwelt among us' 2000 years ago. And so the supposed 'change in substance' (or transubstantiation) of 'bread and wine into the Eucharist' is pure superstition or magic using **spells** that simply **contain** the name of Jesus, and thereby **defile** His name. Thus, realizing that the Eucharist is 'the Only universally recognized **image** on the face of the earth that has *life breathed into it'* - although it is *false life* breathed by the *false prophet* - and of course considering the other points written in Section 5.2, it becomes obvious that the Eucharist is in fact 'the Image of the Beast'.

Now, remembering that many parts of the Bible (in particular the Book of Revelation) use figurative language, Revelation 13.15 says, "The Image of the Beast should both speak and cause as many as would not worship the Image of the Beast to be killed"; realizing here that it is 'the men speaking for the Image' that 'makes it speak'. So the Catholic hierarchy, by speaking lies from behind the Eucharist or Image of the Beast, has condemned all who do not worship their 'false idol and god' to eternal damnation. With this 'dictator-like' mentality, the Catholic Church has done (that we know of) unspeakable acts (such as the Inquisitions and Crusades to name a few) over the centuries under the disguise of 'the righteousness and holiness associated with the name of Jesus'. Now we can look at things such as the Inquisitions and agree that they were wrong, but we must realize that it was 'the Eucharist and a perceived association with Jesus' that gave the Catholic Church their perceived authority to think that they could justly do these unspeakable acts in the first place. So the Eucharist is the Catholic Church's Source of control and power. The Eucharist is the source of the Catholic Church's false authority, and is still in place to this day. And to this day, people are still held captive and

<u>beaten</u> in the spiritual realm with <u>guilt</u>, <u>shame</u>, and the threat of <u>eternal damnation</u>. That is, <u>the</u>

<u>Catholic Church still</u>, <u>to this day</u>, has the <u>authority</u> (from Satan) to conduct 'silent inquisitions' in the <u>unseen realm of their 'worldwide spiritual prison'</u>; a <u>prison without walls</u> that 'goes everywhere you go'. Thus through these <u>silent inquisitions</u> that inflict 'guilt, shame, and the threat of eternal death', and through 'macro level supremacy and exclusion' projected by 'No salvation outside Catholicism'</u>, the Image of the Beast (or the Eucharist) still <u>speaks</u> and is the <u>direct cause</u> of both A) <u>spiritual</u>, <u>emotional</u>, <u>and mental death</u> among Catholic people, as well as people of other religions who have adopted certain Catholic mindsets, and B) <u>physical death</u> among nations and individuals of <u>differing religious</u> ideology who <u>refuse to worship</u>, serve, and 'bow down to' the Image of the Beast... thereby of course 'Causing as many as would <u>not worship</u> the Image of the Beast to be <u>killed</u>'.

And so we must ultimately recognize that the Catholic Church has spoken lies from behind the Image of the Beast, using it as a 'puppet Jesus' in order to falsely justify war and death throughout the centuries, thereby attempting to unrighteously dominate the nations... all under the disguise of 'the righteous name of Jesus'. That is, the Image of the Beast, or the Eucharist, is the means by which the Catholic Church, throughout the centuries, has 'controlled the name of Jesus', and so is also therefore the means by which the Catholic Church has attempted to 'physically, spiritually, emotionally, and mentally control all the nations of the world'. Or we can write the equation:

<u>control of Jesus</u> = <u>control of multitudes</u> and <u>nations</u>

Think here of the Catholic Church's absolute power over nations in the Middle Ages; noting that they still have absolute power in the unseen realm, controlling minds and consciences. Now of course we must understand that 'Catholicism's specific means of controlling Jesus' is 'their exclusive ability to perform the false miracle of transubstantiation'. As mentioned earlier, the 'false miracle of <u>transubstantiation</u>' is the Catholic hierarchy's assertion that 'they alone can breathe life into an inanimate object (i.e., bread and wine) that becomes the true presence of the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ'; remembering here that Revelation 13.15 says that 'The false prophet breathes life into the Image of the Beast'. By the Catholic Church claiming that 'they alone truly **POSSESS** the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ in the Eucharist', then they can also claim a perceived exclusive authority from Jesus. But in truth, what they are doing is 'controlling Jesus', while pretending to 'serve Jesus'; realizing that this is the same type of double tongue lie Herod used when he said "Go and make careful search for the Child (i.e., Jesus); and when you find Him, let me know, so that ! too may go and worship Him" (Matthew 2.8). Herod, the king, was threatened that a new King was to be born, obviously taking (so he thought) Herod's place. And so with the same greed and lust for authority and power as Catholicism, Herod pretended that he wanted to worship or 'serve Jesus', all while having ulterior, hidden motives that secured his continued kingship; possibly at first wanting to 'imprison' or 'control Jesus'. This essentially means that Herod did not want Jesus to rule over him, but rather he, pretending to 'want to serve Jesus', actually wanted to rule over Jesus to secure his own continued power and glory. Hence it is important to recognize that the Catholic hierarchy are

essentially **just like Herod**, knowing that, **if** they had lived in Jesus' day, they surely would **not** have given up their 'kingships and lordships' to this 'new King'. But, living after Jesus died, it is quite easy for the Catholic hierarchy to say 'We serve and worship Christ', all to secure for themselves 'the Kingship of Christ'. And so again, if you have 'perceived authority from Jesus' by saying 'We serve and worship Jesus', then you have succeeded in *controlling Jesus*, by which you can consequently 'control nations by the **fear** associated with God'; realizing that there is no better way to convince people of this 'perceived' authority from Jesus' than to claim that 'We alone (i.e., the Catholic hierarchy) have sole control over creating the Eucharist (the supposed life force of Christ in an inanimate object which suspiciously cannot refute this claim)'. Thus, the Catholic Church has used the Eucharist (the control of Jesus) as an exclusive means of 'controlling nations'; both physically in the past, and spiritually in the present. And if we are <u>still **physically** at war and fighting</u> each other <u>because of</u> the Catholic Church's <u>dominance</u> in the spiritual realm, then we are still unknowingly controlled physically in the present by the Catholic Church... and we don't even know it. To further explain, by owning exclusive rights to 'the fabrication of a false Jesus (i.e., transubstantiation)', the Catholic Church has projected a false monopoly on God and Jesus, thereby enabling them to create and implement 'man-made laws' under the disguise of 'God's laws'; with this of course being the breeding ground of 'division, war, and hate', as capturing exclusive rights to Jesus means that you can <u>also</u> capture people's *minds* and *consciences*, and make them **fight for you as if** they were fighting for Jesus Himself. So the **idolatry** of the **Catholic Church** is mind control using 'a control image and the name of Jesus' to ultimately rule over nations and qovernments. Again, the Catholic hierarchy 'controls Jesus' in order to 'control nations'; remembering of course that they are Satan's blind puppets, hence it is ultimately Satan who controls the nations in the unseen realm.

Now, in order for Satan to 'control the nations in the unseen realm', we must understand that Satan needed to convince the Catholic Forefathers that 'Jesus truly intended for them to create an image (i.e., the Eucharist) of Him'. So, Satan (as mentioned in Section 1) merely took what Jesus said in Scripture, changed the intention, and created a drastically different and defiled outcome from 'what Jesus originally intended' (see Sections 7&8); realizing here that Catholic Forefathers accepted 'Satan's changed intentions of Scripture' because it would coincidentally secure their authority and control over men and nations. Thus, the Catholic Forefathers (being tempted with 'the control of nations as in Luke 4.5-7') played right into Satan's hands, becoming his blind, unknowing puppets, creating and worshiping a false idol, or 'false Jesus' (i.e., the Eucharist), based off of gross biblical misinterpretations; noting here that Paul, in 1 Timothy 4.1, says 'The Spirit warns that in latter times people will give heed to deceiving spirits and doctrines of demons'. And so knowing 'ahead of time' that Satan would convince vain, arrogant men, for their own glory, to misinterpret and change the intention of His words, Jesus said:

"Then if <u>anyone</u> says to you, '<u>Look, here is the Christ!</u>' <u>Do not believe it</u>. For <u>false christs and false prophets will arise</u> and show <u>great signs</u> and <u>wonders</u> to <u>deceive</u>, if <u>possible</u>, <u>even the elect</u>. See, I have told you <u>ahead of time</u>" (Matthew 24.23-25).

And so it is important to realize that, regardless of Christ telling us 2000 years ago that 'False christs and false prophets will deceive us (remembering that Satan and his blind ministers, keeping their deceptions hidden, deceives by twisting and distorting the word of God so that we think we are doing God's will) with great signs and wonders, saying 'Look, here is Jesus'', we see the Catholic hierarchy every week in Mass, twisting and distorting Jesus' words and intentions at the Last Supper (again, see Section 7&8), saying 'Look, here is Jesus'. To further explain, in a Catholic Mass the priest claims that, 'through the power of transubstantiation', he possesses in his hand 'the true presence of the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ'. That is, 'bread and wine' have supposedly been transformed, through 'a (false) divine mystery', into 'the actual Christ'. The priest, on the altar, then proceeds to hold up in the air 'a piece of bread and a cup of wine' (i.e., the Eucharist) and proclaim 'This is Jesus, the Lamb of **God'**. So we must think, how can this **possibly** be Jesus' teaching if He already warned us '**Do not** believe anyone who says to you 'Look, here is the Christ!" I.e., is it not double minded and contradictory (speaking with a *forked tongue* like Satan) for Jesus to say 'Do not believe anyone who says to you 'Look, here is the Christ!" - realizing that 'anyone' even includes the Apostles - then for Jesus also to have SUPPOSEdly instituted the Eucharist, so that, at some point on any given Sunday, many priests (i.e., many false christs, see also Matthew 24.5) are all standing up on an altar saying 'Look, here is the Christ!' (or 'This is Jesus, the Lamb of God!')? And so knowing that 'the idea of Jesus being truly present in the Eucharist' turns Jesus' words and intentions in Matthew 24.23-25 (and reiterated in verse 26) into complete, double minded nonsense (realizing that Paul, in 1 Timothy 6.20-21, warns of 'Those who <u>rename</u> their babblings, <u>contradictions</u>, and false knowledge <u>as being</u> true knowledge'), the only logical conclusion is that the Catholic hierarchy and the Catholic Forefathers (in addition to many Christian leaders) are in fact 'the false christs' - of course saying 'You need me to be saved because I am the only person who can create the Eucharist and forgive your sins' - and 'the false prophets' who have arisen, showing great signs and wonders (i.e., the supposed Eucharistic Miracles), thereby <u>deceiving</u> (of course for their own control of nations and absolute power) the Whole World (i.e., 'even the elect', whoever you consider 'the elect' to be, see also Revelation 12.9 and 1 John 5.19) by blatant misinterpretations and contradictions, and with 'a false Jesus' (i.e., the Eucharist), saying 'Look, here is Jesus!'... while the whole time it has actually been 'a false christ created by false christs' (remembering that these 'false christs' are disguised of course as 'ministers of righteousness' as in 2 Corinthians 11.15, and as 'keepers of true knowledge'). And Jesus even told us these things 'ahead of time', 2000 years ago. Note also here that it is not coincidental that, only 8 verses before saying in Matthew 24.23 'Do not believe anyone who says 'Look, here is the Christ!", Jesus even mentions the Abomination of Desolation, which is the Eucharist (i.e., a false christ). Additionally it should be noted that, if Catholicism believes that its sacred tradition somehow supersedes, or makes Jesus' words (concerning all of these 'false christs') 'dead' (or not applicable), Jesus assures us at the end of this passage (i.e., only 10 verses later in Matthew 24.35) 'Heaven and earth will pass away, but My words will never pass away (i.e., die)'.

Now here we must recognize that one of the most obvious, blatant misinterpretations by the Catholic hierarchy is the way they have somehow rationalized and interpreted the 1st Commandment to 'not include images of Christ, Mary, the Apostles, etc.'; remembering from Section 1 that Satan tricked Eve into blindly transgressing God's Commandment, while thinking she would be getting closer to God, saying to Eve 'Surely God would want you to eat from the tree so that you will be more God-like and virtuous' (Genesis 3.5)... of course with the serpent ('the most cunning beast in the field') appearing righteous, and having 'a helpful, caring, and soothing tone of voice', which most likely came to Eve as 'a still, small voice or whisper' (see 1 Kings 19.12). Think about it. The 1st, Primary, and most important Commandment (as Jesus alludes to in Matthew 22.37-38) clearly says 'You shall not make, serve, or bow down to a carved image; which includes any likeness of anything in heaven or on earth' (Exodus 20.4-5). Is Jesus not in heaven (having also 'dwelt on the earth')? And is the <u>Eucharist</u> not 'an <u>image</u> or a <u>likeness</u> of <u>Jesus</u>'? And so the Catholic hierarchy has been <u>tricked</u>, just as **Eve** was tricked, saying to themselves (after being tempted by Satan), 'Surely God did not mean to include images and likenesses of Jesus in the 1st Commandment'. But of course the Catholic Church will assert that 'The Eucharist is not an image, but rather the actual Christ'. Well if this were so, then the Eucharist, being the actual Christ, could walk, talk, and breathe. But it can't walk, talk, or breathe, so it is **not** the **actual** Christ, thereby leaving the Catholic hierarchy saying, with their forked tongue, 'Well it is Jesus, but it's not actually Jesus'; claiming that this is 'the beauty of their divine mystery', while actually being 'the beauty of Satan's deceitfulness and lies'. We must remember here that, the <u>reason</u> for the 1st Commandment is because of 'the lies spoken by false prophets from behind false idols, which thereby create false gods, or false personas of God'. Surely we can understand in today's world how people can manipulate photos and speak slanderous lies from behind a photo (which parallels an idol), thereby creating 'false personas for the person in a photo'. So can we not also understand that people can <u>manipulate an image of Christ</u> - i.e., the <u>Eucharist</u> - and <u>speak slanderous</u> lies from behind that image, thereby creating 'false personas of God' (i.e., Catholicism itself)? So by the Catholic Church making 'an image of Christ', they blatantly (of course being tricked by Satan into thinking that they are upholding the 1st Commandment) break the 1st Commandment of the Law (written by Moses), and thereby **imply** that Jesus was (in Matthew 24.23-25, the following quote, and many other places) 'double minded' and spoke with a 'double tongue', contradicting Himself. We must know that Jesus clearly says in Matthew 5.17&19 "Do not think I have come to destroy the Law of Moses (i.e., the 10 Commandments) and the teachings of the Prophets. I did not come to destroy, but to fulfill. Whoever therefore breaks one of the least of the Commandments, and teaches men so (thereby breaking the New Covenant), shall be called <u>least</u> in the kingdom of heaven." Hence, Jesus would be contradicting Himself by supposedly 'directing us to break the 1st Commandment of the Law of Moses' as implied by Catholicism's false interpretations of the Last Supper - as He clearly states that 'He did not come to destroy or do away with the Law of Moses'... even adding that 'Anyone who <u>breaks</u> the Commandments (<u>especially</u> the <u>1st</u> Commandment) will be <u>last</u> in God's kingdom'. And so a blatant contradiction such as the Catholic Church asserting that 'Jesus told them to make an image

of Him', thereby breaking the 1st, Primary, and most important Commandment, can only have originated from the forked tongue of Satan, who speaks in contradictions, thereby tricking people into transgressing God's Commandments; many times (like Adam and Eve) while thinking that they are honoring God, becoming more God-like, and upholding His Commandments. Reiterating the 1st Commandment, and the blatancy of Catholicism's transgression of 'making, serving, and bowing down to the Eucharist', God tells Moses in Exodus 20.23 "You shall not make anything to be with Me; gods of silver or gods of gold (including gods of bread, such as the Eucharist) you shall not make for yourself".

As mentioned earlier, a <u>Catholic Mass</u> is the ceremony where 'the priest consecrates the Eucharist'; which is actually just 'the speaking of spiritual spells by which the dead, inanimate bread and wine supposedly turns (i.e., transubstantiates) into Jesus, a living Being'... making it well disguised, **normalized sorcery**. And now knowing (of course after **reviewing** supporting evidence in Sections 7&8) that this 'supposedly divine miracle' was instituted, not by Christ, but by the false christs (i.e., Satan's ministers disguised as Jesus' ministers of righteousness) of the early Catholic Church (in the interest of controlling Jesus, thereby controlling nations), it must be recognized that the Catholic hierarchy (as discussed further in Section 14) forces people, under the threat or fear of eternal damnation, to attend their weekly Catholic Mass. Think about it. If the Catholic Forefathers created a control image that was to be used to *control nations*, what benefit would that control image do if people never saw it? Therefore, by skillfully attaching 'their weekly obligation to attend Mass on Sunday' to 'God's 3'd <u>Commandment</u>' - which, as mentioned in <u>Section 14</u>, says <u>nothing</u> about 'performing any ritual or ceremony on the Sabbath', and was purely 'a quaranteed day of rest' after 430 years of Egyptian enslavement - the Catholic hierarchy has ensured that people show up every week to listen to them 'disseminate their weekly propaganda message' (i.e., the Anti-Good News); which is all spoken from behind 'what people are taught to believe is truly Jesus' (i.e., the Eucharist), thereby making people 'blindly pledge their allegiance to the leaders of Catholicism' while thinking that they are 'pledging their allegiance to <u>Jesus</u> and <u>God</u>'. And again, this 'controlling of <u>Jesus</u>' is done in order to 'control <u>minds</u> and consciences', making people (as unwitting slaves) fight to protect a god (i.e. Catholicism and its hierarchy) that people think is **God**, with the ultimate goal of **world domination**, 'controlling all nations of the world'... as promised by Satan to the Catholic Forefathers (just like in Luke 4.5-7). Now this ultimately means that, while the **Roman** Catholic Church has **disguised** their Mass as 'a celebration of Jesus', it is really 'a celebration of man's lust for control and power' which has been inherited from their forefathers of 'Roman times' (see Sections 5.1 and 5.2); of course noting the influence of 'Rome and their mindset of world domination' on Catholicism. We must therefore understand that the Catholic Mass is anything but righteous, and Catholicism has skillfully attached 'their weekly obligation to attend Mass' to the 3rd Commandment - breaking the 3rd Commandment without appearing to do so by 'changing the intention of Scripture' - purely as a means of 'disseminating their propaganda message', which **ensures** their <u>continued</u> **authority** and **control** over the multitudes; although it is a **false authority** bestowed upon them by Satan, not Jesus or God. And so, if the Mass is 'a celebration of man's dominance over other men', then it is actually 'a celebration of Satan' and his cunning ability to 'use the

name of Jesus to create a false idol (i.e., the Eucharist) and a false god (i.e., Catholicism)', which he (Satan) then uses to 'make one man an unknowing slave to another', ultimately 'making both men slaves to Satan'. Note here that, as the 3rd Commandment (i.e., the instituting of the Sabbath) was written for people who had been physically enslaved for 430 years in Egypt, we must realize that 'the spiritual, mental, emotional, and (consequential) physical enslavement practices of Catholicism' are in direct opposition to the very essence of the 3rd Commandment, which insured, at least for 1 day a week, freedom from the oppression of men in places of authority; making 'Catholicism's, and any other religion's Sabbath' (i.e., the practicing of rituals, sacrifices, and ceremonies on the Sabbath) actually 'an anti-Sabbath', and 'a hidden symbol of Slavery'. Thus, 'the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass' (i.e., 'the celebration of the Eucharist') is not 'a celebration of Jesus', but rather 'a celebration of Satan' (and his deceptive abilities), and how ultimately Satan enslaves us with the names of God and Jesus, changing the intentions of Their OWN Commandments so that it is he (Satan) who dominates and controls the world in the unseen realm.

And so since 'the <u>Mass</u> and the (supposedly) <u>Holy Sacrifice of the Mass</u> (i.e., the Eucharist)' is actually 'a celebration of <u>Satan</u>' disguised as 'a celebration of <u>Jesus</u>', this means that 'the <u>Mass'</u> (i.e., the ceremony involving 'the fabrication of the Eucharist') is simply just a pagan ritual, which is one of 'symbolic flesh and blood' that we have inherited from 'the bloody idol worshiping days' of places like Rome and Samaria, where they sacrificed to false gods and their respective false idols. Now the Romans worshipped false gods like <u>Jupiter</u> and <u>Apollo</u>, with 'idols meant to <u>represent</u> those gods'. But, on the other hand, the <u>Samaritans</u>, just like the Catholic Church today, worshiped '<u>what they thought</u> was <u>the</u> God who brought them out of the land of Egypt' (see 1 Kings 12.28), representing that god with a golden calf; just as Catholicism represents 'what they think is Jesus' with 'a piece of bread', worshiping 'what they think is God' by performing a 'faux, bloody sacrifice' (i.e., the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass). It should be noted here that, whether the Bible uses 'a capital <u>G'</u> or 'a lower case <u>g'</u>, by saying 'the <u>God</u> (or <u>god</u>) who <u>brought you out of the land of **Egypt**</u>' was a way of identifying '<u>the one</u>, true God', and if the writer used 'a lower case g', then they are inferring that someone 'took the one, true God's name in vain' in order to deceive people... which was the case in Samaria, as well as with **Catholicism**. And so the Samaritans (led by **Jeroboam** with the motive of 'keeping control and power over his people') mixed the teachings of Moses with pagan idol worship to create 'a sort of parallel (to Judaism), counterfeit religion' (not implying here that Judaism was righteous, but rather it was Judaism that <u>originally</u> kept and propagated the 10 Commandments), with this counterfeit religion using 'the name of the God of Israel', although representing Him with a false idol (i.e., a golden calf). Note here that is widely unrecognized and therefore extremely understated that when Aaron fashioned a golden calf in Exodus 32.4, the Israelites also named their false idol 'the God who brought them out of the land of Egypt', using 'a capital G'... although Moses wrote down 'lower case god' to convey that it was not 'the real God who brought them out of Egypt', whereas Hosea 8.6 says outrightly that 'The golden calf of Samaria is made by workmen, so it is **not** (capital G) **God**', showing that 'the **golden calf**, just

like the Eucharist, was <u>Widely perceived</u> by the people as <u>truly being God</u>'. Now by creating this 'parallel, <u>counterfeit religion</u>' and 'golden calf that was named God', the <u>Samaritans</u> (specifically the priests or leaders) were then able to essentially '<u>speak for God</u>' from behind their golden calf, essentially '<u>changing the original intentions</u> of the teachings (or Law) of Moses' in order to 'create manmade laws' that were <u>disguised as</u> 'God's laws'. So we must realize that, for <u>thousands</u> of years, vain men such as the <u>priests</u> and <u>leaders</u> of <u>Samaria</u>, <u>Rome</u>, and <u>Catholicism</u> have practiced '<u>pagan idol</u> worship rituals' in order to <u>Speak for their idol</u> - and ultimately the <u>god</u> (which is <u>ultimately just</u> '<u>the leaders themselves'</u>) that their idol represents - thereby instituting 'their <u>own</u> man-made laws' under the <u>disguise</u> of being 'the laws of <u>God</u>, or <u>any other god</u>, such as <u>Jupiter</u>, <u>Apollo</u>, <u>Bel</u>, <u>Baal</u>, etc.', all with the interest of controlling the multitudes</u>. That is, just as <u>Catholicism controls (i.e., speak for) the Eucharist</u> in order to <u>control nations</u>, so too did <u>Jeroboam</u> and his <u>priests</u> control (i.e., speak for) their golden calf to also <u>control the nation of Israel</u>.

Again it must be stressed that, it is **not** so much the fact that 'the **Samaritans** made a **golden calf** named <u>God</u>', or that 'the <u>Catholics</u> make a <u>loaf</u> or <u>piece of bread</u> (i.e., the <u>Eucharist</u>) <u>named Jesus</u>', as if 'the mere sight of a statue or piece of bread' enrages God. Rather it is 'the lies that are spoken in the names of God and Jesus from behind the golden calf and the Eucharist' which enrage God and bring about His wrath, as 'these lies' cause the enslavement and desolation of humanity. Here we must understand that this is **Why** false idols are so <u>deceptively harmless</u> 'in the <u>eyes</u> of most humans', as '<u>we do not see</u> what God sees', seeing and feeling 'the lies that are attached to a false idol'. Here it helps to think how you would feel if someone 'took a picture of you', and then spoke unspeakable lies from behind that picture, with the whole world <u>believing</u> that 'those <u>lies</u> were actually <u>truth</u>'... and you **not** being able to physically speak and defend yourself regarding those lies. So it is 'the lies that accompany a false idol' that are a defilement to God, and not so much 'the actual false idol itself'. I.e., it has shattered the hearts of both God and Jesus beyond measure to see the Eucharist (of course thereby <u>enraging Them beyond measure</u>) because <u>the **Eucharist** represents **unspeakable**</u> **lies** that have been told in the <u>name</u> of <u>Jesus</u>, and <u>about Jesus</u>... <u>lies</u> that we cannot **see** or **feel**. Thus, both 'the <u>Eucharist</u> worshiped by the Catholics' and 'the <u>golden calf</u> worshiped by the Samaritans' represent **Satan**, not Jesus or God; as Hosea 8.6 says about 'the golden calf of Samaria', 'A workman made it (just as a priest makes the Eucharist), and so it is not God'. Both the Eucharist and the golden calf represent 'lies spoken in the name of God', which result in 'man-made laws' that are disguised as 'God's laws', resulting in 'division, war, and hate' in the name of God. Both the Eucharist and the golden calf represent Satan's cunning ability to 'tell the best lies by changing the original intention of the word of God', thereby defiling the word of God... without us even knowing it. Both the Eucharist and the **golden calf** represent Satan's cunning ability to 'turn the truth into a lie'; and he does so right in plain sight with 'idols that are named God and Jesus'. And so both of these false idols, the Eucharist and the golden calf, represent Satan's cunning ability to 'turn God (i.e., His persona) into a false **god**', right in **plain sight** before our **unseeing** and **unfeeling** eyes, using **God's** and **Jesus'** own words,

and people (i.e., false prophets and false teachers) who boldly claim to **know God** and **Jesus**, when in fact the 'only one' they **know** is 'Satan <u>disquised as</u> God and/or Jesus'.

The <u>historical precedent</u> of <u>idolatry</u> set by <u>Samaria</u> bears a *striking resemblance* to <u>Catholicism</u>, as they too feared the name of God, yet did not fear His Commandments (of course making a false idol), thereby unknowingly fearing man-made commandments (or laws) which were created in God's name; of course realizing that, these 'man-made commandments themselves' acted as a false god (or false persona of God) that they blindly served as being the one true God. Hence, Jeroboam, 'the king of the Northern Kingdom of Samaria', fearing that he would lose CONTrO and power over his people (see 1 Kings 12.27), exploited (i.e., added to, changed the intention of, etc.) the teachings of Moses in order to set up the parallel, counterfeit religion of 'Samaritanism' (using this 'term' for ease of reference). And they used 'the name of the God who brought them out of Egypt' (1 Kings 12.28), and created a golden calf (i.e., 'an image of something in heaven or on earth') to represent God, in order to then create 'a <u>false god</u> before the one true God'. That is, they created a <u>false god</u> with the <u>hidden</u> (even to them) name of <u>Samaritanism</u>, but the OUTWARD deceiving name of <u>'capital G' 'God'</u>. So Jeroboam set up his own houses of worship, installed his own priests, and appointed his own feast days (1 Kings 12.31&32), all to ultimately install his own laws that guaranteed his continued control over the people, with the *priests* being Jeroboam's eyes and ears, and speaking words for Jeroboam from 'the power position of a temple' (and of course from behind the golden calf) so that people thought that they were truly <u>God's words</u>. So it is important here to recognize that 'Jeroboam <u>spoke lies</u> in the <u>name</u> of God, from behind a golden calf named God' in order to then make his own laws that guaranteed control and power over his people. These laws were instituted under the pretense of 'being from God', therefore people of course <u>submitted</u> to Jeroboam's laws out of 'the <u>fear</u> associated with God'. Or as Isaiah 29.13 says, 'The people are taught unrighteous fear of God by the commandments of men'. So, while Jeroboam's false idol (i.e., the golden calf) was used as a control symbol in order to institute manmade laws and make people submit (i.e., the control of multitudes, tribes, and nations) to those laws out of 'fear of not submitting to God', it was Jeroboam's religion itself, 'Samaritanism', that was actually acting as the false god; noting here the parallel with the Eucharist being Catholicism's control symbol or image, with <u>Catholicism itself</u> (i.e., its doctrine) being the actual false god. To clarify, the religion of <u>Samaritanism</u> (i.e., Jeroboam's man-made laws) was a set of beliefs 'of man, <u>not</u> God', so it, just like <u>Catholicism</u>, was a <u>false god</u>. While the <u>golden calf</u>, just like the <u>Eucharist</u>, was the <u>false idol</u> or control symbol that made people **bow**, out of the **fear** of not submitting to God, to the man-made laws of the false god, 'Samaritanism'; just as people bow to the man-made laws of the false god 'Catholicism'. Therefore, the Samaritans, as noted in 2 Kings 17.33 'feared the name of God', yet unknowingly were serving (before the one true God) the false god, **Samaritanism**, which Jeroboam had created to maintain control and power. And, following in the Samaritan's footsteps, Catholics also 'fear the name of <u>God</u>', yet <u>unknowingly serve</u> (before the one true God) the <u>false god</u>, **Catholicism**, which the <u>Catholic</u> Forefathers created (and is *propagated* by the present day Catholic hierarchy) in order to 'obtain and keep' control and power over nations (i.e., absolute power and world domination). As 2 Kings 17.33 says 'They fear the Lord, yet serve their OWN god'; which is reiterated in Zephaniah 1.5 when he says

"They <u>worship</u> and <u>swear oaths by the **Lord**, <u>but **also** swear by **Molech**</u> (a false god)". Thus we can see that **both Samaritanism** and **Catholicism** have:</u>

<u>A)</u> created <u>false idols</u> (i.e., the <u>golden calf</u> and the <u>Eucharist</u>) that people <u>truly perceive</u> as <u>being God</u> (remembering that it is 'their set of beliefs' that is 'their <u>actual god</u>'),

<u>B)</u> built <u>temples</u>, <u>churches</u>, and <u>houses of worship</u> as <u>power positions</u> to <u>Validate</u> their <u>idolatry</u>, and make people <u>submit</u>, out of <u>fear</u>, to 'the man-made laws spoken from behind their <u>idols</u> (i.e., <u>control images</u>)' <u>as if</u> they were submitting to God Himself (realizing here that <u>temples</u> themselves are in fact just '<u>large idols</u>' with '<u>lies</u> being spoken from <u>inside</u> of a <u>temple</u>'), and

<u>C)</u> enlisted <u>priests</u> to <u>disseminate</u>, <u>enforce</u>, and <u>propagate</u> (by of course <u>changing the intentions</u> of the word of God or Jesus) the <u>false gods</u> '<u>Samaritanism and Catholicism</u>'.

And <u>both</u> Samaritanism and Catholicism have ultimately done these things all to 'attain and maintain' CONTROL over multitudes, tribes, nations, etc. Again, 'control of God or Jesus' = 'control of multitudes and nations'. Think about it. To gain control of 'an <u>idol</u> that people <u>think is Jesus</u> and <u>supposedly removes sins'</u>, is to also gain an <u>enormous</u> amount of <u>power</u>. And the <u>unrighteous power</u> that the Roman Catholic Church has gained over the whole world for almost 2 millennia is 'a <u>product</u> of them controlling such an idol': a <u>false Jesus</u>, the <u>Eucharist</u>.

Here it is also important to consider 'normalization'. Satan, being 'a living demon' just like God is 'a Living God', stays normalized in every age of man, thereby keeping his deceptions 'not so transparent'. Think about it. With a golden calf being used by Aaron and Jeroboam, and the present (at least 'Western') world being able to look back on them in the past, clearly identifying them as being false idols, are we to naïvely think that Satan is going to continue 'trying to get people to worship golden calves'? That is, we must realize that, if Satan wants to deceive the whole world, he would SUTE of not again use a golden calf to do so - as we have already identified it as being 'a false idol' - but rather, Satan would surely use 'something associated with Christ', and 'something supposedly Jesus approved and Jesus instituted' so that it is **normal** and **comfortable** to us, with us therefore not even realizing that we have been 'deceived into worshiping a false idol'; remember, 'Satan's deceptions know no <u>boundaries</u>'. Now with the whole world, either <u>directly</u> (i.e., knowingly) or <u>indirectly</u> (i.e., unknowingly) bowing to the **Eucharist**, this of course means that, as smart and as knowledgeable as we think we are, we have still been deceived by Satan and his normalized, comfortable false idol (i.e., the Eucharist) named 'Jesus'... consequently meaning that 'We are no different than those pagan Samaritans' or 'those pagan Israelites', blindly worshiping 'Satan's <u>newest version</u> of a <u>golden</u> calf', which he has cunningly named 'Jesus'. And so we must recognize that the language Jeroboam used some 2900 years ago is the **very same** language used at every **Catholic pagan Mass**, yet in a Catholic pagan Mass, the words used are normalized, comfortable, and disguised as 'language of

divinity', using associations with 'names of past righteousness' (i.e., Jesus, Mary, Peter, Paul, etc.), thereby keeping their idolatry hidden (even from themselves); realizing that Jeroboam and his priests also surely called on familiar, comfortable, and normalized 'names of past righteousness' (such as Moses, Abraham, and of course 'the God who brought them out of slavery in Egypt') to sell his idolatry to the people as truly being 'God-like and God approved'. It should also be noted here, in terms of normalization, that 'a 2nd generation Samaritan being born into worshiping a golden calf' would therefore think that this idolatry is quite normal in their mind; making us understand how 'a Catholic born into worshiping a piece of bread' will also think that this idolatry is quite normal in their mind. And now the following compares 'what Jeroboam said to his people in 1 Kings 12.28' to 'what a Catholic priest says every week in Mass', with of course the divine language stripped away in order to show that 'the golden calf (or molded image out of gold) that the Samaritans worshiped' is effectively the same as 'the Eucharist (or molded image out of bread) that Catholicism worships'.

<u>Jeroboam</u> said to his people 'This <u>molded image</u> out of <u>**gold**</u> is your <u>**god**</u> who brought you up out of the land of Egypt (i.e., it <u>saves people</u> and sets them <u>free</u>)'.

A <u>Catholic priest</u> at a Catholic pagan Mass says 'This <u>molded image</u> out of <u>bread</u> is your <u>god</u> who takes away the sins of the world (i.e., it <u>saves people</u> and sets them <u>free</u>), happy are those who are called to his supper'.

Thus, if you strip away all of the <u>beautifully deceptive</u>, <u>supposedly holy language</u> and <u>name</u> <u>associations</u>, it becomes obvious that, for nearly 2 millennia, we have been <u>just as guilty</u> as the <u>Samaritans</u> of 'blindly worshiping a <u>false idol</u> (i.e., the Eucharist)'; although one of the <u>hardest concepts</u> to fathom in our minds is that <u>we have essentially assigned to 'our golden calf'</u> the <u>holy</u>, <u>normalized</u>, and <u>comfortable name</u> of 'Jesus'. And so we must put our <u>egos</u> aside and recognize that 'Satan is <u>better at lying</u> than our minds will <u>even allow</u> us to believe', with his <u>lies</u> (contrary to what many believe is even possible) centering around 'the <u>name</u> of God', and '<u>any</u> and <u>all false</u>, dead, and inanimate representations (i.e., images) of the one true Living God'... with emphasis on 'Living'.

Now in the Old Testament - which we should recognize as **primarily** being 'an <u>account</u> of <u>people</u> <u>worshiping false idols</u> and <u>false gods</u>' - the true Prophets of God were always <u>distinguishing false idols</u> and <u>images</u> by 'their lack of breath', lacking 'God's breath of life that makes a human (or animal) a <u>living being</u>' (Genesis 2.7), thereby making 'the <u>hallmark</u> of <u>false</u>, molded idols and images' the fact that 'they are dead, inanimate, and without breath', just like a rock or a block of wood. As Habakkuk 2.18&19 says, 'There is <u>no breath</u> in <u>stone</u> or <u>wood</u>. Woe to the false prophet who <u>speaks</u> from behind <u>silent</u>, mute stone and <u>breathless wood</u>, making a molded image into a <u>teacher of lies</u>'. And Jeremiah 51.17&18 says, "For his <u>molded image</u> is <u>falsehood</u>, and there is <u>no breath</u> in them. They are futile, and a <u>work of errors</u>." Therefore, with God being 'the <u>God of the living</u>, <u>not</u> the <u>God of the dead</u>' (Mark 12.27), the best way (according to <u>all</u> of God's true Prophets) to <u>spot</u> and <u>identify</u> a <u>false idol</u> is <u>simply</u>

'whether or not it breathes and is alive'. That is, if it can't walk, talk, eat, drink, or anything else a living being can do, then it is most definitely a dead, inanimate, false idol (or false representative of God); realizing here that false prophets, who themselves act as false idols (or false representatives of God), are somewhat harder to identify, as they can breathe and tell beautifully deceptive lies that seem like truth. Yet, at the very least, it should be easy enough for any cognizant person (or animal, for that matter) to identify 'whether or not something contains God's breath of life' in order to determine if it is a false idol. And so just as it is obvious to us (in the future) that the people of Samaria and the Israelites were worshiping a dead, lifeless golden calf, thereby labeling them as being evil, we must come to the devastating reality (that is, to our pride and egos) that it is also obvious that we too - recognizing that the Eucharist obviously can't walk, talk, or breathe - are worshiping a dead, lifeless Eucharist; ultimately meaning that 'we are blindly just as evil as those evil Samaritans and Israelites', and 'we are blindly just like the people we thought and said we could never be like'.

But of course what has tricked us for so long is that the Catholic hierarchy, by bully tactics, bold assertions, and sleight-of-hand magic and sorcery, has insisted that 'The Eucharist is alive', even misinterpreting, twisting, and changing the intentions of Scripture (i.e., 'living bread' from John 6.51) to back up their claim; realizing here that the **Babylonians** were also tricked by **priests** into believing that 'The false idol, **Bel**, is **alive**' (which is discussed momentarily). Hence we must know and realize (as discussed further in Section 7) that the Eucharist has no breath, therefore it is a false idol, and when Jesus referred to 'living bread' He was simply referring to 'Himself', 'a living, walking, talking, eating, drinking, and <u>breathing Being</u>', as 'Jesus in the flesh' (i.e., the <u>Word</u>) was the <u>only One</u> who could 'literally speak the word of God'; realizing (from Matthew 4.4) that if 'the word of God' = 'bread from heaven', and Jesus (the Word) 'spoke this figurative bread', then that means that 'Jesus in the flesh' = '<u>Ilving bread</u>'. So as much as Catholicism, with '<u>sleight-of-hand false miracles</u>' (i.e., '<u>great signs</u> and wonders to deceive from Matthew 24.23-25), has deceived the multitudes with 'the supposed actual flesh of Christ' (i.e., the supposed Eucharistic Miracles), at the end of the day none of it matters **anyway**, as 'Jesus' dead, inanimate, non-breathing flesh' (as represented by the Eucharist) cannot possibly be 'living bread', as it cannot walk, talk, or breathe as only 'Jesus in the flesh' could do, speaking the word of God, with 'the word of God ingested into our minds' being of supreme importance for salvation. Think about it. The idea of 'ingesting Jesus' actual flesh' (regardless of whether or not you believe it contains Jesus' Spirit or life force) is a cannibalistic mentality, just like cannibals in the South Pacific who thought that 'by eating a human being, they would ingest that person's life force'; which we can all recognize as being total nonsense. As Jesus says in Mark 7.15-19 and Matthew **15.11-17**, 'There is <u>nothing</u> (<u>not even Jesus' actual flesh</u>, even <u>if the Man Himself</u> were to <u>cut it from His</u> living body) a man can eat that will affect (for better or worse) what is in his heart (i.e., his soul or spirit). And you must come to the **basic understanding** that, **anything** entering a person's **mouth**, goes into their stomach (not their heart) and is eliminated'. This means that, as basic as may sound, Jesus **Himself** essentially tells us that 'It is a <u>cannibalistic</u>, <u>caveman mentality</u> to <u>believe</u> that <u>eating the</u> **Eucharist** can **affect** your **soul**, as anything and everything a person eats simply goes into their <u>stomach</u>

and is <u>eliminated</u>, <u>without it coming in contact with their inner being</u>' (again see Section 7). Again we must think that, for Jesus to say 'Nothing you eat can affect your soul', then to supposedly (according to Catholic doctrine) say 'Eating the Eucharist will affect your soul (giving eternal life)' is a forked tongue, contradiction, spoken by 'men peddling their babblings, contradictions, and false knowledge as being true knowledge' (1 Timothy 6.20), and is therefore a clear indicator that Catholicism's warped knowledge was 'eaten (i.e., digested into their minds, not their stomachs) from Satan's tree of false knowledge'. Thus, we must ultimately recognize that the Eucharist, just like every other 'false idol and molded image' spoken of by God's true Prophets in the Old Testament, is dead, lifeless, breathless, and inanimate, making it impossible for it to be 'living bread from heaven'. I.e., we must know the difference between 'Jesus' flesh' and 'Jesus in the flesh' in order to identify the lies (so <u>close</u> to the <u>truth</u>) and <u>misinterpretations</u> that we have inherited. '<u>Jesus' flesh is</u> dead' (for those that truly believe 'the Eucharist is Jesus' flesh'), while 'Jesus in the flesh is alive', making Him 'living bread'; it's that simple (remembering that 'Jesus spoke with simple language', not with the convoluted, double minded language the Catholic hierarchy uses to deceive). Therefore, 'the dead, nonbreathing Eucharist that we have inherited from the Catholic Forefathers' is nothing more than, as Jeremiah says, 'a futile work of errors', that was of course made in the interest of controlling minds, consciences, and ultimately <u>nations</u>. Remember, God is 'the God of the <u>living</u>, <u>not</u> the <u>dead</u>', making living beings, while it is man, in his futile attempt to have the supremacy and authority of God, that makes <u>dead</u> idols in the interest of 'deceiving other men in order to then <u>control</u> and <u>enslave</u> them'. So if we cannot tell the difference between 'a <u>dead idol</u> and a <u>living being</u>' - such as the <u>difference</u> between 'a dead, lifeless piece of bread' and 'the living, breathing Jesus who walked among us 2000 years ago' then we will continue to be **deceived** by men who 'hunger' after control and power; realizing of course that these men 'don't literally eat control and power'.

So we must ask ourselves, 'Why have we been worshipping a dead idol (i.e., the Eucharist) for so long without questioning the leaders of the Catholic Church?' The answer is fear. The Catholic Church has projected the idea that 'we should fear the Eucharist just as we fear God', thus making us not question the Eucharist or 'the men who make the Eucharist'. That is, the Catholic hierarchy has projected the idea that 'if we question the validity of them or the Eucharist, then we are essentially questioning God'.

And so they have taught us to fear 'them and their false idol' as though they were God; by of course 'Teaching man-made rules as though they were God's rules' (Matthew 15.9). But as Baruch 6.63&64 essentially says, 'We should not fear the Eucharist because it is merely an inanimate object, incapable of hurting or helping us'. He says "It is neither to be thought, nor to be said, that they (i.e., false idols of wood, stone, etc.) are gods: since they (false idols) are neither able to judge causes, nor do any good to men. Therefore, knowing that they are not gods, fear them not." So we must know and understand that the Eucharist, being dead and lifeless, is not the Living Jesus, and we should therefore not fear the Eucharist'.

Now the best way to <u>overcome</u> our <u>fear</u> of the Eucharist is to '<u>put</u> the <u>Eucharist</u> and the <u>priests</u> who make the Eucharist to the <u>test'</u>, <u>just as Daniel 'put Bel and the priests of Bel to the test'</u> in <u>Daniel 14.1-22</u>. Remember, God is 'the God of the <u>living</u>, <u>not</u> the God of the <u>dead'</u>, thus <u>dead idols</u> are 'the work of <u>men and Satan'</u>. And since the Eucharist is 'a dead idol made by the <u>hands and fingers of men'</u> (Isaiah 2.8), by 'putting the Eucharist to the test', we are merely 'putting man and Satan to the test'; we are <u>not</u> 'putting <u>God</u> to the test'. It is extremely important to know the <u>difference</u>, especially when speaking to <u>men</u> (i.e., Catholic priests) who have been <u>deceived</u> by Satan into <u>thinking</u> that 'they are actually <u>performing a service</u> for God' (John 16.2). 'The Story of Daniel and Bel' (from Daniel 14.1-22) - which shows <u>Daniel proving</u> to the <u>King</u> that '<u>Bel</u> (just like the <u>Eucharist</u>) is a <u>dead</u>, lifeless idol that was thought to be alive' - is as follows.

The Babylonians had an idol named Bel, and every day the people provided for Bel 6 bushels of flour, 40 sheep, and 6 measures of wine. The King revered Bel and went every day to worship it. But **Daniel**, who was a friend of the King, did not worship Bel. The King asked Daniel 'Why do you not worship Bel?', and Daniel responded by saying 'I do not revere dead idols that are made by men; I only revere the Living God' (14.5). The King responded by saying, 'If Bel is not alive, how is it that he eats so much every day'. Daniel laughed and replied, 'Do not be deceived, Bel is made of clay and bronze, and has never eaten anything'. Enraged, the King called the 70 priests of Bel and said "Unless you tell me who it is that consumes these provisions, you shall die. But if you can show that Bel consumes them, Daniel shall die for blaspheming Bel" (14.8). So they all went to the temple of Bel, and the priests of Bel said "See, we are going to <u>leave</u>. You, O King, set out the <u>food</u> and prepare the <u>wine</u>; then <u>shut the door and seal it</u> with your ring" (14.11). When the priests left, Daniel Scattered ashes all over the floor of the temple. That night, the priests with their wives and children, entered into the temple through a **secret entrance** (as they did every night) and **consumed** all of the **food** and **wine**. The next morning the King opened the temple door, and upon seeing that everything was consumed he cried aloud "You are great, O Bel; there is no deceit in you" (14.18). But Daniel laughed and told the King to look at all of the **footprints** in the **ashes** that were made by the priests and their families. In his wrath, the King executed all of the priests of Bel, and Daniel destroyed Bel and its temple.

So, just as Daniel '<u>tested</u> the <u>priests</u> of the <u>false idol Bel'</u>, we too must <u>also</u> '<u>test the priests who make</u> <u>the false idol known as the Eucharist'</u>. That is, <u>if</u> the Eucharist is <u>truly</u> 'the <u>body</u>, <u>blood</u>, <u>soul</u>, <u>and</u> <u>divinity of Christ'</u>, then we should be able to '<u>ask the Eucharist a question'</u> and it will give us a <u>response</u>, just as the <u>Living Christ</u> would <u>respond</u>. We should be able to '<u>offer the Eucharist something to eat'</u> and it should be <u>able to eat it</u>, just as the <u>Living Jesus ate</u> after He was raised <u>from the dead</u> (Luke 24.43). And we should be able to '<u>walk side-by-side with the Eucharist'</u>, just as Jesus' disciples walked side-by-side with the <u>Living Christ</u> on the road to Emmaus. But as it is, <u>the Eucharist Cannot speak</u>, <u>eat</u>, <u>or walk</u>. In other words, just like the <u>false idol</u> in <u>Isaiah 46.6-7</u>, '<u>men must speak for the Eucharist'</u>, and

'men must walk the Eucharist around' because it is just like Bel: a dead idol that is 'without the breath of life'. Hence, just like Daniel, we should tell 'the King (or Pope) of the Catholic Church' that 'We <u>do not revere dead idols such as the Eucharist</u> that are made by men; we only revere the <u>Living God</u>' (Daniel 14.5). Furthermore, it must be pointed out how strong the King's belief was in 'something so obviously fake to Daniel', paralleling this to 'the strong belief that people have in the Eucharist', even after realizing that it is **dead**. Therefore, notice how the King **still** cried aloud 'There is **no deceit** in you, Bel', even when 'the footprints of humans' were 'staring him right in the face'. And so just as Daniel <u>laughed</u> at 'the King's <u>lack of ability</u> to recognize the <u>obvious</u>', we too should <u>laugh</u> at 'the Catholic hierarchy's lack of ability in recognizing the obvious'. That is, we should laugh at the Catholic hierarchy's perceptive abilities, as they interpret everything under a magnifying glass ('straining out the gnat'), yet they cannot - even when 'staring at the information (just like 'the footprints in the ashes') right in front of their faces' - interpret the **obvious**, recurring main idea of the entire Old Testament: 'Do not make or worship false idols and/or false gods'... even when it is stated over and over again. Thus, if we put the <u>priests</u> of the Catholic Church to the same basic test as Daniel, they will fail just like the priests of Bel because, just like Bel, the Eucharist is a dead idol that can't possibly be 'living bread' (i.e., 'the living, breathing, walking, and talking Jesus'). And we must ultimately recognize that, just as the golden calf was 'associated with the name 'capital G' 'God", the Eucharist is merely an idol that is 'associated with the name of Jesus' to inflict fear upon the multitudes in order to get them to unknowingly **submit** to 'man and Satan' - **thinking** that they are **submitting** to 'God and Jesus' - thereby gaining <u>control</u> and <u>power</u> over *multitudes* and *nations* through 'the <u>fear</u> <u>associated with</u> the <u>names</u> of God and Jesus'. Again, as Baruch 6.64 says, 'Do not fear false idols'; which equates to 'not fearing the **Eucharist**' (i.e., the false man-made doctrine spoken from behind the Eucharist), and 'not fearing putting the Catholic hierarchy to the test', as their 'supposedly holy and divine Eucharist' will without question show itself, just like **Bel**, as 'a **dead**, lifeless, futile work of **man-made** errors' passed down from the Catholic Forefathers to inflict fear and gain control and power. As Jeremiah says, 'Surely our fathers have inherited lies'... from our Catholic Forefathers. Therefore, we must be like Daniel, and laugh at the Eucharist because it is so Obviously fake and so Obviously dead, being a mere fabrication of men to create an unbreakable bond with Jesus and His Apostles, with the motive of 'controlling nations'.

So in addition to the Eucharist being 'obviously fake' or 'made up', we must recognize that the Catholic hierarchy's supposed connection to Jesus and His Apostles is also 'made-up', as they say 'We know Jesus and are led by the Holy Spirit', although this claim is a mere fabrication. Remember here that in Hosea 8.2, Israel also said 'We know God'. Yet Hosea 8.4&5 makes it clear that 'Israel has set up kings and princes in the name of God (of course spoken from behind 'the golden calf of Samaria', which was named God) that are not at all acknowledged by God, nor did He grant them authority'. And so just as the leaders of Israel (i.e., Jeroboam's descendants) clearly were not acknowledged by God (still practicing idolatry), and thereby did not receive any authority from Godalthough claiming their authority was from God (i.e., 'We know God') - we must recognize that

Catholicism has done the <u>same</u>, claiming to 'know Jesus', therefore having a <u>special connection</u> with Him and His Apostles; which of course they then <u>perceive</u> as 'a <u>bestowing of **keys** of authority</u>'. But, as they still (just as the Samaritans) practice idolatry, the Catholic hierarchy's supposed authority over us (just like their supposed connection to Jesus and His Apostles) is false (meaning their keys are also *false*), and they have <u>lied</u> to <u>us</u> and <u>themselves</u> by acting as though some sort of established *connection* to Jesus and **Peter** (in particular) would somehow place them in 'a superior position to us before God'. First off, we must recognize that, by placing themselves in 'a superior position to us, as false mediators between us and God', the Catholic hierarchy in fact violates 'the equality clause' of the New Covenant; which is God's Law or <u>Commandment</u> that states '<u>Everyone</u> from **prostitute to Pope** knows God <u>equally</u> and the same'. So remembering that, "He who says 'I know Him (Jesus)' and does not keep His Commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him" (1 John 2.4), we can (as they break the New Covenant) therefore *deduce* that the Catholic hierarchy 'does not know Jesus' - in fact they could *not recognize* Jesus even if they were talking to Him in person - and they prove that they are **bold liars** by *breaking* the very (New) Covenant (i.e., God's *Commandment*) that Jesus died for. Nonetheless, they have attempted to create an unbreakable bond to Jesus through Peter in order to secure **control** and **power**; to be in 'a superior position to us before God'. Now the Pope of the Catholic Church claims that he can trace his *lineage* (i.e., supposed connection) all the way back to **Peter** the Apostle. But, what he doesn't realize is that, even if the Pope can bind himself to some sort of manmade succession that supposedly originated from Peter, and thus try to claim that 'Peter gave the Pope's predecessors the keys of the kingdom of heaven' (Matthew 16.19), it would still do him no **good**. And this is so because the Catholic Papacy (or 'office of the Pope') has made a gross **misinterpretation** by believing that 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven' are some sort of 'bestowing of authority' on the Apostles (in particular, Peter). But the fact is that 'keys do not equate to <u>authority</u>'; rather 'keys <u>equate</u> to <u>knowledge</u>'. That is, <u>keys = knowledge</u>, <u>not authority</u> (Luke 11.52, and see **Section 10**), so that *true* keys = *true* knowledge; noting here that, although Peter **never** mentions receiving any sort of 'keys of authority from Jesus' in his writings, he does however mention 'the **knowledge** of Jesus' at least 7 times. And this knowledge given to the Apostles is 'the knowledge it would take (being used as **figurative keys**) for **they themselves** to enter through the **figurative gates** of heaven'; which is 'the knowledge of true forgiveness and true judgment'. This knowledge is summarized by Paul in Romans 2.1; "For in whatever you judge another you condemn yourself." I.e., since 'we are all **one** body of people', then by 'not forgiving others', you bind their sins as your sins, and you will be condemned for 'your sins and the sins of others that you would **not** forgive'; noting here that many times the other people did not even sin, yet 'the person perceiving an innocent person as a being sinful' will be condemned for 'what they perceived as sinful'. In the Catholic hierarchy's (and many other religious leaders') case, they will be condemned to eternal damnation for 'condemning innocent people to eternal damnation', with these innocent people being wrongly perceived as 'sinful for not worshipping the false god made in the religious leader's own image' ... realizing that this is the essence of "For in whatever you judge another you condemn yourself." But, on the other hand, if you 'forgive

the sins of others' (thereby essentially forgiving yourself, because 'we all belong to the same body of people'), then you loose their sins and your sins, and you will not be condemned. So the fact that the Catholic Church produces 'supremacy instead of equality' (see Section 9) by practicing 'the art of forgiving yourself, Without forgiving others' in the Sacrament of Confession, makes it quite obvious that they have **no true knowledge** of 'true forgiveness and true judgment', and therefore **no** 'true keys'. Hence it is impossible that the Catholic hierarchy posses 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven' because 'keys = knowledge', and they are clearly without (true) knowledge; noting that, if this (i.e., that the Catholic hierarchy adheres to *false knowledge*) is hard to believe, then Why would there be a **need** for the **apocalypse**, which is 'a revealing of **true** knowledge that has been hidden for 2000 years'? And so since 'the Catholic hierarchy's knowledge' is actually false knowledge, then 'any keys' that they posses are in fact 'false, fake keys of the kingdom of heaven' that they have used (by practicing unrighteous authority just like Adam and Eve) to ironically and unknowingly 'enter through the gates of the kingdom of Satan'; ultimately meaning that the Catholic hierarchy's supposed connection with Jesus and His Apostles (i.e., their lineage, succession, or 'passing on of keys') is a fabrication (based on gross biblical misinterpretation) from the minds of the Catholic Forefathers in their lust to control nations through unrighteous association with Christ.

Here we must realize that the 'succession' the Catholic Church believes in is not 'the way God chooses His leaders'. Succession is corruptible - usually corrupted by money - and so succession is a line of thought that is 'of man and Satan', not God. Succession is the same ideology as 'royal families' who have the man-made idea that 'each person born into a certain family has been chosen by God to rule (i.e., divine right to rule)'; which is a mentality of course propagated by those same royal families to of course secure their continued control and power from one generation to the next. Now the Catholic Church (being sort of a *theocracy* instead of a *monarchy*) is set up with this <u>same</u> type of mentality, believing that they are a sort of 'royal family', with God (which is really Satan disguised as God) choosing each consecutive ruler or Pope; who also rules by the false, man-made idea of divine right to rule, and the consequential idea (to inflict the unrighteous fear of God) that 'it is therefore a Sin against God to oppose the Pope'. Of course 'the problem with this mindset of succession' is that, as these 'leaders of succession' (i.e., kings, princes, Popes, etc.) are usually indelibly ingrained in the warped mentalities of their predecessors, succession usually leads to the continued enslavement and oppression of multitudes of people. Now many people are under the delusion that 'the Holy Spirit essentially chooses Popes' (supposedly 'quiding a council of men (i.e., Cardinals)', who surely are indelibly ingrained in the warped ideologies of their predecessors), thereby (supposedly) eliminating the possibility of being *corrupted* or *influenced* by <u>money</u>. If this is so, then we must ask ourselves, 'How did the **Medici** (royal) family - probably the most powerful (i.e., wealthy) family in the world at that time - manage to produce 4 Popes in a span of only 92 years from 1513 to 1605?' Are we to believe that 'the Holy Spirit chose 4 men from the most influential and powerful family in the world in order to imitate Christ, a common Carpenter'? So the fact is that the Holy Spirit did not choose the *Medici Popes*, but rather *men* chose the *Medici Popes* in order to maintain control and power, thus

proving (by sheer common sense) that the Catholic hierarchy's succession (or 'passing on of the <u>keys'</u>) is <u>tainted</u> by <u>corruptible motives</u>. Additionally, it must be noted that the <u>3rd</u> Medici Pope, <u>Pious</u> IV, was Pope from 1559 until 1565, during which (in 1563) the Council of Trent was adjourned. The Council of Trent is the **Dogma** that the Catholic Church **still** holds to until **today**, of course affirming the idea of 'the true presence of Christ in the Eucharist'. So here we must think, what does it say about the Catholic Dogma after realizing that it was overseen and adjourned under a Pope that was obviously not chosen by the Holy Spirit? ... obviously it says that their doctrine is 'of man and Satan', and based on warped, indelibly ingrained mindsets of predecessors who have been corrupted by money, influence, control, and power. Therefore, as Catholicism's lineage, and CONSEQUENTLY their doctrine, have clearly been **corrupted** by Satan, we can draw a certain conclusion that 'Catholicism's idea of the **keys** of the kingdom of heaven (thinking they are 'keys of authority') being passed on from one Pope to the next, like <u>succession</u> in a <u>royal family</u> which <u>supposedly originated</u> with <u>Peter</u>', is an idea that <u>men</u> (i.e., the <u>Catholic Forefathers</u>) have <u>concocted</u> to <u>keep</u> their 'own kind' in <u>power</u>, propagating their enslavement of multitudes to themselves; of course meaning that Catholicism's idea of succession and <u>lineage</u> is simply another <u>inherited lie</u>. As Jeremiah says, "Surely our fathers have inherited lies"... from the Catholic Forefathers.

As far as the Pope's claim that 'essentially Peter is his ancestor (so to speak), and he is a descendent in a **long line** (i.e., **lineage**) of Roman Pontiffs who have all inherited **keys** to heaven' (wrongly believing that those keys = authority), we must consider, in basic terms, what exactly the Catholic hierarchy is claiming. So in basic terms, the Pope is claiming that, because he and the Popes before him can all trace a succession of consecutive Popes back to Peter himself, then, since Peter is considered to be a <u>righteous</u> man (having been *chosen* by *Christ* to be an Apostle), then each Pope (or at least 'the office of the Papacy') after Peter is also therefore considered to be 'righteous (or as Catholicism says 'infallible') and chosen by Christ'; supposedly acting in accordance with 'what Peter and Christ would do'. So we must come to a basic realization here about human nature and many people's **love** of **glory**. Consider if you found out that your ancestor (someone you don't know and obviously never met) killed hundreds of innocent people and swindled thousands of people out of their life's savings. Most people will of course disassociate themselves with that ancestor, saying 'Well, I'm nothing like him'. But on the other hand, many people would give the exact opposite response if they found out that their ancestor was a prince or king. That is, many people will say 'Well, I must also be a prince or king, or at least someone higher in class than I previously thought... I'm just like my ancestor'. And so depending on whether or not our ancestors are looked at favorably or non-favorably, we double mindedly change our response. But, the truth is that the first response - 'I'm nothing like my ancestor' - is always the correct response, and we prove it to ourselves if an ancestor is looked at in a non-favorable light. So the **simple** truth (remembering that <u>Jesus spoke in **simplistic** terms</u>) is that '<u>lineage</u> has <u>absolutely</u> no bearing on who or what we are'; i.e., 'bloodline' or 'lineage' is a meaningless man-made constraint when you consider that 'We are all made from the **same blood** anyway' (Acts 17.26). Therefore, if we can understand this <u>basic idea</u> that 'who we came from has <u>absolutely nothing</u> to do

with who we are (whether good or bad)', then why do we continue to give credence to the Pope's outrageously nonsensical idea that 'He came from Peter, so he must be like Peter'; knowing that the Catholic hierarchy has done this out of 'the love of glory', and if Peter was looked at non-favorably today, then they would by all means disassociate themselves from Peter. And so as the Pope claims that 'He came from Peter, so he must be like Peter', we must remember that 1 John 2.19 warns us that 'The antichrists came from Peter and the Apostles, but they were (obviously) nothing like Peter and the Apostles'... actually being the total opposite (i.e., anti) of the Apostles. Here we should also remember that, in both Luke 3.8 and John 8.33, the Jews were essentially claiming that 'They too were righteous, chosen, free, superior, knowledgeable, etc. (i.e., basically infallible in the knowledge of matters involving God) because of their lineage that they could trace back to Abraham'. But in both instances, both Jesus and John the Baptist essentially said 'You are nothing like Abraham, and your lineage is meaningless and worthless, having nothing to do with Who you are'. Thus, whether or not the Catholic Pope can trace some kind of lineage back to Peter is (according to Jesus and John the Baptist) immaterial and meaningless, having absolutely nothing to do with 'his OWN righteousness' (and consequently 'the righteousness of the Catholic Church itself').

Now of course we must recognize that, because of this 'supposed connection with Peter', the Pope (like the Jews that Jesus and John the Baptist were talking to you) is considered by Catholicism to be **infallible** in 'matters involving the laws of God'; again, wrongly believing that 'keys' are some sort of 'the bestowing of <u>authority</u> to <u>write laws</u> in the name of God'. But what they **don't** realize is that Peter, just like 'any supposed (by Catholicism) descendants of Peter', was capable of unknowingly speaking for Satan, and not even realizing it, thereby obviously making Peter quite fallible and quite blind to the fact that he Was fallible; meaning that 'any Pope claiming lineage to Peter' is just as blindly fallible as Peter. Now this is referencing Matthew 16.22-23 where Peter, thinking that he is saying something out of *love* and *concern*, says to Jesus 'God forbid that You are put to death'; with Jesus replying to **Peter** 'Get behind Me, **Satan!** You are an offense to Me, for you (**Peter**) are **not mindful** of the things of **God**, but the things of **men**.' So here we must understand that, <u>Satan</u>, <u>not</u> wanting Jesus to die and be raised from the dead (as this ultimately, upon <u>Jesus' return</u>, means '<u>Satan being cast into</u> hell'), disguised his voice as God's voice in Peter's mind, finely crafting his will (which involves the continued desolation of humanity) to sound like 'the will of God' (i.e., making his 'words that lead (in an indirect, hidden way) to hate', sound like 'words of caring, concern, and love'). Hence, it has been highly understated (surely *obscured* by Catholicism so as to not 'call into question their claim of infallibility') that, even in the very presence of Jesus (the Son of God), Peter truly thought and **believed** that he Spoke the will of **God**, while actually Satan ('the most cunning beast in the field') **tricked** Peter - making 'hate and malice' (for humanity) sound like 'love and concern' - into unknowingly Speaking the will of Satan; i.e., speaking for Satan, and not even knowing it. This means that, if a Catholic Pope (realizing that they are **not even** physically standing in the **presence** of Christ)

claims lineage to Peter, then he is just as susceptible to unknowingly and blindly speaking for Satan, and is therefore very much fallible, just as Peter was fallible; realizing that Peter never claimed to be infallible, and Catholicism has created 'a false persona for Peter' by implying that he, or any of the Apostles, were infallible. Additionally, a major discrepancy must be pointed out in this context. Catholicism, again not understanding that 'keys' = 'the knowledge of true forgiveness and true judgment', claims that, only 3 verses previous to Matthew 16.22-23 (in Matthew 16.19), 'Jesus gave Peter the keys of authority to write (i.e., bind or loose) laws in the name of God' (that is, by saying 'This is a sin' or 'That is not a sin', governments then write laws based off of these assertions). So we must think, **how** is it **possible** for 'Jesus to have given Peter keys of authority to write laws **in the name** of God' (as Catholicism claims occurred in Matthew 16.19), then Only 4 verses later for Jesus to say to Peter 'You **speak** what Satan tells you to speak, and you don't even know it. You (**Peter**) are **not** mindful of the things of God'? Thus, we can conclude that A) 'keys' in Matthew 16.19 were not 'keys of authority', as Jesus clearly would **not grant** to Peter 'the keys of authority to make laws in <u>God's name'</u>, as he was (from Matthew <u>16.23</u>) '<u>not mindful</u> of <u>discerning</u> between the <u>voice of God</u> and the voice of Satan', and that B) Peter (never claiming to be infallible) was not infallible. And so as Peter 'never had any keys of authority', and was quite fallible, any 'lineage to Peter' that Catholicism tries to claim simply means that they too 'never had any keys of authority', and they too are quite fallible... ultimately realizing that the Catholic hierarchy and the Catholic Pope have claimed these things (i.e., 'keys of authority' and infallibility) to of course have control over all the nations of the world.

Many people, of course being born into the <u>normalized idolatry</u> of worshiping a false idol that goes by '<u>the harmless, innocuous, and loving name of Jesus</u>', will therefore <u>underestimate</u> the <u>Eucharist</u> as <u>truly being</u> 'our <u>source</u> of division, war, and hate' for the past 2 mellenia... and that is <u>exactly</u> what Satan is <u>hoping</u> people will do, <u>dismissing</u> the <u>proof</u> (i.e., this text) that is written right in front of their eyes, and <u>dismissing</u> the fact that the <u>Old Testament</u> is essentially a <u>history book</u> (<u>not</u> '<u>a book</u> of <u>spiritual spells</u>' as we have made the Bible out to be) that <u>mostly</u> tells of '<u>people worshiping false</u> <u>gods and false idols</u>, which thereby <u>Causes</u> <u>division, war, and hate</u> among people and nations'.

Remember here how the people of <u>Laish</u> were <u>slaughtered</u> by the <u>Danites</u>, who perceived themselves as having some sort of 'power from God' by <u>owning</u> Micah's <u>idols</u> and <u>priest</u>; realizing therefore that:

'ownership of an idol'

=

'a perceived physical connection to the spiritual world'

=

'perceived power from, or even ownership of God or a god'

=

'deranged minds who conquer others thinking that God or a god approves of their brutality'.

And this is exactly what Catholicism has thought for the last almost 2000 years, having 'ownership of the Eucharist', therefore thinking that 'their agenda of world domination and absolute power is approved by God'. Hence, many people, underestimating it, will look at the Eucharist - after being told that 'It is a *false, dead, inanimate <u>idol</u>, just like any other <u>breathless</u> false idol of the Old Testament' - and say '<u>No</u>* way, the <u>Eucharist is harmless</u> (as they think it <u>is</u> Jesus), it can't possibly have <u>caused</u> (through the deranged minds of the Catholic hierarchy who think 'owning the Eucharist' = 'their approval from God to <u>conquer</u> nations') worldwide division, war, and hate for the past **2** millennia'... which again, is <u>exactly</u> what Satan hopes people will say, underestimating the consequences and effects of idolatry. So idolatry - remembering that people can't fathom 'the lies spoken from behind false idols' because they were raised to believe that 'those lies are truth' - therefore has many unseen, unfathomable negative consequences that span generations; consequences and effects that may even seem unrelated in the present generation because we did not live in the past generations when the idolatry caused the initial division. In other words, we can't see what caused the religious divisions in the past, we only see the war and hate in today's world, wondering where it came from, not thinking (with 'a plank in our own eye') that it could possibly be an unfathomable negative consequence of the same idolatry that we still practice today, thinking that 'our idolatry (that we don't believe is really idolatry) is our only hope for world peace'; remembering again that 'Satan's lies and deceptions know no boundaries'.

Here it helps to consider our own **American** (in particular) **history**, reminding ourselves **why** this country was founded, and the mindsets of those (i.e., the American founders) who did not want '<u>religion</u> to be intertwined (at least <u>directly</u>) with <u>government</u>' (i.e., they wanted '<u>separation of church</u> and state'). We must consider - as it is harder for us in today's world (being born under 'separation of church and state') to fully grasp (firsthand) the oppression, tyranny, and absolute power wielded by institutions such as Catholicism (and its offshoot, the Church of England) - what people in the past saw, felt, and experienced firsthand that drove them to get as far away from these oppressive, absolute dictators as possible; knowing that these people surely saw, felt, and experienced firsthand the idea that 'absolute power corrupts absolutely'. And so we must realize that people in our past saw firsthand the <u>correlation</u> between *religion* and *tyranny*; i.e., the correlation between 'owning an idol' and '<u>deranged minds</u> that <u>abusively rule</u> over others, thinking (like <u>Adam</u> and <u>Eve</u>) that their lust to <u>conquer</u> others is <u>God-approved</u>'. We must realize that people in our <u>past</u> - whether <u>fully cognizant</u> of it, or just 'feeling it' - saw firsthand that 'the concept of organized religion', being organized into normalized (by the **name** of God) **mobs**, had become a **mechanism** for 'supremacy, division, exclusion, and oppression'; **not** 'equality, unity, inclusion, and liberty'. And we must realize that people in our **past** saw **firsthand** that 'the concept of <u>organized religion</u>' (i.e., the practicing of **rituals** and **ceremonies** by <u>macro level</u> herds) was causing people to <u>judge</u>, <u>hate</u>, and ultimately <u>kill</u> (i.e., <u>stampede</u>) for <u>no reason at all</u>, saying, 'We have a <u>better</u> way of worshiping God than you' and '<u>Our god</u> (i.e., religion) is <u>better</u> than <u>your god</u>, therefore we <u>are better</u> than you, and so we will <u>rule over</u> and <u>control you</u>'. Thus we should pay careful attention to history and the reactions of historical individuals (and groups) in centuries past who had **firsthand** knowledge of the abuse of power that was rooted in the idolatrous religious practices of institutions such as Catholicism; who of course have **ownership** of the false idol, the **Eucharist** (a

perceived physical connection to the <u>spiritual world</u>), thereby <u>slaughtering</u> and <u>conquering</u> others, and causing the <u>enslavement</u> of <u>countless generations</u>, while thinking that their '<u>crimes against</u> <u>humanity</u>' are <u>justified</u> because they stand <u>behind</u> 'what they <u>think</u> is <u>Jesus</u>, and consequently <u>righteousness</u>'... while it is really '<u>Satan</u> and his well disguised <u>corruption</u>'.

Remembering that the *consequences* and *effects* of the Catholic Church's <u>idolatry</u> may be *seen* or <u>unseen</u> (i.e., <u>directly related</u> or <u>seemingly unrelated</u>), we must ask ourselves, why did the founders of the United States of America create a nation where religion, not God, was removed from government? Why did the Protestant Reformation take place? Why did the Crusades take place? Why did the **Inquisitions** take place? Why do Muslims and Jews fight over land to this day, and why do Muslims, Christians, Hindus, and Jews hate each other for no real reason, causing countless battles and divisions over the centuries?... thinking here of such things as the **Armenian Genocide** of the early 1900s, with *Muslims* practicing supremacy over, and oppression of *Christians*, thereby leading to 1.5 million deaths. Why have Protestants and Catholics slaughtered each other over the last 500 years? Why has the world seen <u>unprecedented advances</u> in technology, government, and personal liberty <u>only</u> since 'the Protestant Reformation and subsequent Separation from the Catholic Church's idolatry'? Why did the genocide of <u>6 million Jews</u> take place in World War II, and Where did Adolph Hitler's <u>anti-</u> <u>Semitic</u> attitude <u>originate</u>? Why did the United States fight an unnecessary, bloody <u>Civil War</u>? And finally, why were the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center attacked by terrorists on September 11, 2001. The answer to Why all these events *took place* can be traced back to our *divisions* concerning **religious ideology**, which eventually - either <u>directly</u> or <u>indirectly</u> - will lead back to <u>the</u> **source** of those divisions: a false idol named 'the Eucharist'. Thus, by looking at this 'snapshot' (meaning there is <u>much more</u> than is mentioned here) of the past say 1000 years of history, it becomes <u>obvious</u> that 'the source of division, war, and hate' (even if it is hard to see in our present generation with 'separation of church and state' and American freedom) is the Eucharist: a false image of Jesus from behind which men have spoken lies, thereby causing (by of course 'the creation of many false personas of God' that approve of 'crimes against humanity') unfathomable negative consequences and effects in the names of Jesus and God. And we must ultimately therefore realize that, we have simply divided ourselves for nothing at all. We have divided ourselves protecting and honoring a false idol (i.e., the Eucharist) and a false god (i.e., Catholicism itself) that does not even exist, thereby causing others to 'divide and create their own false gods (i.e., religions)' in order to compete with Catholicism, with multitudes of people then all *fighting*, *killing*, and *warring* to <u>protect false gods</u> that <u>do not</u> even exist; meaning that we have killed each other for absolutely no reason at all. Again, Satan's deceptions are boundless, and he has caused (for the last 2 millennia) our desolation over a totally meaningless (i.e., having nothing to do with Christ's true intentions) piece of bread.

You would have a very different opinion of the Catholic Church if you could momentarily step back in time to the Inquisitions and the absolute power prevalent in the Middle or Dark Ages; remembering here the unspeakably vile and sadistic torture techniques (i.e., burnings, beatings, suffocations, and drownings) and **devices** (i.e., the **iron maiden**, the **breast ripper**, the **heretic's fork**, the **pear**, the <u>rack</u>, and the <u>Judas craddle</u>) crafted by the Catholic hierarchy (<u>truly</u> Satan's blind workers) to make people <u>submit to</u> and <u>worship them</u> (<u>disquised</u> of course as 'submitting to and worshiping <u>Christ</u>'). Ironically it must be noted here that, the whole time the Catholic hierarchy was doing these unspeakable acts during the Inquisitions, they were doing so 'pointing their finger at everyone else, and labeling them as heretics', while in reality, it was the Catholic hierarchy who were, the entire time, (and still are) 'the greatest heretics the world has ever seen', with doctrine that is totally contrary to (among others) God's Primary Commandment. So, in the Dark Ages, the Catholic Church - either directly or *indirectly* - dominated over *science*, *technology*, *government*, *art*, *music*, and of course *religion*, as well as 'every' and 'any' aspect of people's personal life and liberties (focusing heavily on people's **Sexual liberty**)... thereby living up to the term *Dark Ages*. And this 'doctrine of domination', a product of the false knowledge (or 'bad, poisonous fruit') perpetuated by Catholic false prophets, of course created a mindset of supremacy, oppression, slavery, and dissension, eventually leading to revolution (i.e., the French Revolution and the American Revolution) and war. Remember, 'False prophets do not bear good fruit' (Matthew 7.15-18); with 'good fruit' being true knowledge in the form of principles such as 'equality and liberty'. So by examining the Middle Ages (or the Dark Ages) under the <u>influence</u> of 'the false prophets of Catholicism', it is quite evident that they produced **bad fruit** (asserting principles of *supremacy* and *enslavement*), while the principles of the American government (i.e., equality and liberty) is 'the good fruit of God's vineyard' produced by Jesus, the 'true Vine' (John 15.1). That is, the personal *liberty, freedom*, and *equality* that we enjoy today in free America is a product or fruit of 'branches' (i.e., people) who followed the voice of Jesus, directly opposing the tyranny, oppression, and absolute power of the Catholic Church, and other such 'theocracies and monarchies' that have bowed to Catholicism's influence or example. I.e., the King of England broke from Catholicism only to 'do what the Catholic Church did', keeping for himself all of the people's tithes and *money* (which equates to *freedom* and *liberty*) that once went directly to Rome. Consequently, American freedom has **obscured** the *tyranny*, *oppression*, and *absolute power* that the Catholic Church once held in the physical realm; yet they (and all religions stemming from Catholicism's existence) still practice tyranny, oppression, and absolute power in the hidden realm as 'hidden kings', influencing both our minds and our consciences, and the minds and consciences of our elected officials... much the same way that the Jewish hierarchy influenced the mind and conscience of Pontius <u>Pilate</u>. And the <u>root</u> of Catholicism's tyranny, oppression, and absolute power, the <u>Eucharist</u>, is <u>still</u> very much in place and thriving today, hiding underneath lies (i.e., dirt) spoken in the name of Jesus, unnoticed and seemingly innocuous... ultimately meaning that we have really Never left the Dark Ages, and we don't even realize it.

Showing again how people in the past *felt* about the Papacy's absolute rule, and the potential for the Pope influencing America, it should be noted that, from the early 1700's to the time of the American Revolution, 'it was **illegal** for a **Catholic to vote** or **hold public office'**. Also, only **1** of the 56 signers of the **Declaration** of **Independence** was <u>Catholic</u>; although he did not even vote on the measure. Another interesting note is that we have only had **ONE Catholic president**, **President John Kennedy**, and he was assassinated. And as soon as his brother Bobby Kennedy looked like he may receive the Democratic Party's **nomination** for president, he \underline{too} was $\underline{assassinated}$. Now we must wonder here, are these some of the most incredible coincidences we've ever seen, or are they not coincidences at all, and God is trying to tell us something? Additionally, most people do not even know that former American presidents, such as Abraham Lincoln and John Adams, as well as other influential historical figures, viewed the Catholic Church - especially 'the order of the <u>Jesuits</u>' - as a <u>deceptively</u> evil institution that Secretly caused a great number of wars, and far too much bloodshed and desolation (which is apparent in the following historical quotes). Ironically, Pope Francis is the first Jesuit Pope, and doesn't understand that he, just like previous Jesuits, is being tricked by Satan (disguised as Jesus) to unknowingly propagate 'what causes division and ultimately war' (i.e., the Eucharist), while thinking that he promotes unity and peace... as it's only 'unity and peace' if we are all 'peacefully united as their mindless slaves'. Thus, as the Catholic hierarchy, Satan's blind, unknowing puppets, have become more adept at hiding their true nature (i.e., their hidden agenda to extinguish personal freedom and liberty) in present times, the following historical quotes are presented to show how people in past times truly felt about the Catholic hierarchy. And these following historical quotes - from people who actually lived during the past three hundred years - give great insight as to the true thoughts of past influential people and their firsthand dealings with the Catholic Church, so that our present generation may try and understand the magnitude of Catholicism's deceptive practices; taking note here how the brutal dictator Adolph Hitler greatly admired 'the splendid ways' of Catholicism. Notice also here that, it seems rather telling that **none** of these historical quotes came from **dates** earlier than roughly 1700, when the idea of a free America was taking shape. This indicates the Catholic Church's brutal iron grip on Europe 'pre-1700', and its ability to squash anything negative about their evil and corrupt empire... something Hitler surely appreciated as well, as 'any voice' that opposed 'his voice' was quickly put to death. Examine the following historical quotes to better understand Catholicism's true hidden nature; which was not quite as hidden in 'the not so distant (pre-television and pre-computer) past', with the television and computer surely being responsible for them hiding their 'secret agenda of world domination'.

John Adams (1735 – 1826; 2nd President of the United States)

"My history of the <u>Jesuits</u> is not eloquently written, but it is <u>supported</u> by <u>unquestionable</u> <u>authorities</u>, [and] is very particular and very <u>horrible</u>. Their [the Jesuit Order's] <u>restoration</u> [in 1814 by Pope Pius VII] is indeed <u>a step toward darkness, cruelty, despotism, [and] death</u>. I do

not like the appearance of the Jesuits. If ever there was a body of men who <u>merited eternal</u> <u>damnation</u> on earth and in hell, it is this Society of [Ignatius de] Loyola."

John Adams, letter to Thomas Jefferson, May 19, 1821

"Can a free government possibly exist with the Roman Catholic religion?"

John Adams, letter to Thomas Jefferson, May 5, 1816

"I do not like the <u>reappearance</u> of the <u>Jesuits</u>. Shall we not have regular swarms of them here, in as many <u>disguises</u> as only a king of the gypsies can assume, dressed as printers, publishers, writers, and schoolmasters? If ever there was a body of men who <u>merited damnation</u> on earth and in hell, it is this Society of Loyola's. Nevertheless, <u>we are compelled by our system</u> of religious toleration (i.e., America's fatal flaw) to offer them an asylum."

Thomas Jefferson (1743 – 1826; 3rd President of the United States)

<u>His reply to John Adams</u>: "Like you, I <u>disapprove</u> of the restoration of the <u>Jesuits</u>, for it means <u>a</u> step **backward** from **light into darkness**."

Adolph Hitler (1889 – 1945; Nazi leader and chancellor of Germany who killed 6 million Jews)

"Above all I have learned from the Jesuits. And so did Lenin too, as far as I recall. The world has never known anything quite so Splendid as the hierarchical structure of the [Roman] Catholic Church. There were quite a few things I simply appropriated from the Jesuits for the use of the [Nazi] Party. In [Heinrich] Himmler [who would become head of the Nazi SS] I see our Ignatius de Loyola [the founder of the Jesuit Order]."

Thomas M. Harris (1817 – 1906; Physician and Union general during the Civil War)

"The organization of the [Roman Catholic] Hierarchy is a complete <u>military despotism</u>, of which the <u>Pope is the ostensible head</u>; but of which, the <u>Black Pope is the real head</u>. The Black Pope is the head of the Order of the Jesuits, and is called a General [i.e., the Superior General]. He not only has command of his own order, but [also] directs and controls the general policy of the [Roman Catholic] Church. He [the Black Pope] is the power behind the throne, and is the real potential head of the Hierarchy. The whole machine is under the strictest rules of military discipline. The whole thought and will of this machine, to plan, propose and execute, is found in its head. There is <u>no independence</u> of <u>thought</u>, or of <u>action</u>, in its <u>subordinate parts</u>. Implicit and <u>Unquestioning obedience</u> to the orders of superiors in authority is the sworn duty of the priesthood of every grade."

Marquis de LaFayette (1757 – 1834; French statesman and general. He served in the American Continental Army under the command of General George Washington during the American Revolutionary War.)

"It is my opinion that <u>if the **liberties** of this **country**</u> – the United States of America – <u>are</u> <u>destroyed</u>, it will be <u>by the **subtlety** of the **Roman Catholic Jesuit priests**, for they are the most <u>Crafty</u>, dangerous <u>enemies</u> to civil and religious <u>liberty</u>. They have <u>instigated MOST of</u> the **Wars** of **Europe**."</u>

Friedrich von Hardenberg (1772 – 1801; German philosopher)

"Never before in the <u>course</u> of the <u>world's history</u> had such a Society [i.e., the <u>Jesuit</u> Order] appeared. The old <u>Roman</u> Senate itself did <u>not</u> lay schemes for <u>world domination</u> with greater certainty of success."

Robert Jefferson Breckinridge (1800 – 1871; Politician and Presbyterian minister)

"The Society of Jesus [i.e., the <u>Jesuit</u> Order] is the <u>enemy of man</u>. The <u>whole human race</u> <u>should Unite for its overthrow</u>. For there is no alternative between its total extirpation, and the <u>absolute corruption</u> and <u>degradation</u> of <u>mankind</u>."

Fyodor Dostoyevsky (1821 – 1881; Russian novelist)

"The Jesuits are simply the <u>Romish army</u> for the <u>earthly sovereignty</u> of the <u>world</u> in the <u>future</u>, with the <u>Pontiff</u> of Rome for <u>emperor</u>... that's their ideal. It is simple <u>lust of power</u>, of filthy earthly gain, of <u>domination</u> – something like a <u>universal Serfdom</u> with <u>them [the Jesuits] as masters</u> – that's all they stand for. They <u>don't even believe</u> in <u>God perhaps</u>."

Napoleon Bonaparte (1769 – 1821; Emperor of the French)

"The <u>Jesuits</u> are a <u>MILITARY</u> organization, <u>not</u> a religious <u>order</u>. Their chief is a general of an army, not the mere father abbot of a monastery. And the <u>aim</u> of this organization is <u>power</u> – <u>power</u> in its most <u>despotic</u> exercise – <u>absolute power</u>, <u>universal power</u>, <u>power to control the world</u> by the volition of a <u>single man</u> [i.e., the Black Pope, the Superior General of the Jesuits]. <u>Jesuitism</u> is the <u>most absolute of despotisms</u> – and at the same time the <u>greatest</u> and most enormous of <u>abuses</u>."

Edmond Paris (1894 – 1970; Author of the book 'The Secret History of the Jesuits')

"The <u>public</u> is practically <u>UNAWARE</u> of the overwhelming <u>responsibility</u> carried by the <u>Vatican</u> and its <u>Jesuits</u> in the <u>Starting</u> of the <u>two World Wars</u> — a situation which may be explained in part by the <u>gigantic finances</u> at the disposition of the Vatican and its Jesuits, giving them <u>power in so many spheres</u>, especially since the last conflict."

J.E.C. Shepherd (1987; Canadian historian)

"Between 1555 and 1931 the **Society of Jesus** [i.e., the **Jesuit** Order] was **expelled** from **at least 83 countries**, **city states**, and **cities**, for engaging in political intrigue and subversion plots

against the welfare of the State, according to the records of a Jesuit priest of repute [Thomas J. Campbell]. Practically every instance of expulsion was for political intrigue, political infiltration, political subversion, and inciting to political insurrection."

Theodor Griesinger (1809 – 1884; German historian)

"The whole frightful <u>responsibility</u> for this <u>terrible Thirty Years' War</u> [1618-1648] must rest upon the [Holy Roman] Emperor Ferdinand II, and his <u>teachers</u>, rulers, and <u>bosom friends</u> – the Sons of Loyola [i.e., the <u>Jesuit Order</u>]."

Abraham Lincoln (1809 – 1865; 16th President of the United States)

"This [American Civil] war [of 1861-1865] would never have been possible without the sinister influence of the Jesuits. We owe it to Popery that we now see our land reddened with the blood of her noblest sons. Though there were great differences of opinion between the South and the North on the question of slavery, neither Jeff Davis [President of the Confederacy] nor anyone of the leading men of the Confederacy Would have dared to attack the North, had they not relied on the promises of the Jesuits, that under the mask of Democracy, the money and arms of the Roman Catholic, even the arms of France, were at their disposal if they would attack us."

"I feel more and more every day that it is <u>not</u> against the Americans of the South, alone, I am fighting. It is more <u>against the **Pope** of Rome, his **Jesuits**, and their **Slaves**. There are <u>only very few of the Southern leaders who are not more or less under the **influence** of the **Jesuits**. Even the **Protestant ministers** are under the <u>influence</u> of the <u>Jesuits</u>, <u>without suspecting it</u>. Rome is doing here what she has done in Mexico, and all the South American Republics; she is paralyzing, by civil war. She <u>divides</u> our nation in order to weaken, subdue and <u>rule it</u>."</u></u>

"I pity the priests, the bishops, and monks of Rome in the United States when the people realize that they are in great part **responsible** for the **tears** and **bloodshed** in this **(Civil) war**. I conceal what I know, for if the people knew the whole truth, this war would turn into a **religious war**, and at once, take a tenfold more **savage bloody character**. It would become merciless as all religious wars are. It would become a war of extermination on **both sides**. The Protestants of both the North and the South would surely exterminate the priests and the Jesuits if they could hear what Professor Morse has said to me of the **plots made in the very city of Rome to destroy this republic**."

"The true motive power [of the Civil War] is <u>secreted</u> behind the thick walls of the Vatican, the <u>Colleges</u> and <u>Schools</u> of the <u>Jesuits</u>. They have continued in a <u>silent</u>, but most <u>efficacious</u> way, to <u>spread their hatred</u> against our <u>institutions</u>, our <u>laws</u>, and our <u>liberties</u> in such a way that this terrible conflict became <u>unavoidable</u> between the North and South... it is <u>Popery</u> that <u>we owe this terrible Civil War</u>. I <u>would have laughed</u> at the man who would have told me that before I became President. But Professor Morse has opened my eyes on that subject. Our people are yet ready to learn and believe those things, and perhaps it is not the proper time to

initiate them into the <u>dark mysteries</u> of <u>hell</u>. <u>Sooner or later the **nation will know**</u>, and then those who have <u>caused</u> those <u>desolations</u> and <u>disasters</u> will be called to <u>give an account</u>."

"I do not pretend to be a prophet. But though not a prophet, <u>I see a very dark cloud</u> on the <u>horizon</u>. And that <u>dark cloud</u> is <u>coming from Rome</u>... a cyclone such as the world has never seen will pass over this country, spreading ruin and desolation from north to south. Neither I nor you, but our children, will see those things."

"So many plots have already been made against my life, that it is a real miracle that they have all failed. But can we expect that God will make a perpetual miracle to save my life? I believe not. The Jesuits are so expert in those deeds of blood that Henry IV (king of France who was assassinated by the Jesuit Revaillac for giving liberty to his people) said that it was impossible to escape them, and he became their victim, though he did all he could to protect himself. My escape from their hands, since the letter of the Pope to Jeff Davis has sharpened a million daggers to pierce my breast, would be more than a miracle. I know that Jesuits never forget nor forsake. Man must not care how and where he dies, provided he dies at the post of honor and duty." Note here that the assassination of President Lincoln was thought to be orchestrated by the Jesuits, and it was concealed that the man who actually assassinated him, John Wilkes Booth, had CONVerted to Catholicism.

We must realize that, for thousands of years, 'religion has been intertwined with government' (i.e., '<u>church</u> and <u>state</u> have been <u>combined</u>'), leading to the potential for 'the abuse of power in the name of <u>God</u> or <u>any god</u>', of course giving rise to <u>absolute power</u>. For thousands of years <u>false prophets</u>, disguising themselves as 'agents of God', have said 'If you don't consult first with God (which is really themselves, being false mediators), then God (or any god) will not bless your nation, make it prosperous, or allow you to live in peace'... and false prophets do all this ultimately for their own glory, as people now must come to them for their supposed wisdom (as in 'Rabbi, Rabbi, enlighten us with your wisdom' from Matthew 23.7-8), which is actually false wisdom from 'Satan's tree of false knowledge'. And so as we are so mentally ingrained by false prophets Claiming that 'they are our necessary, divine connection to God' (thereby violating the New Covenant as false mediators), to many people, especially *younger* people trying to figure out 'the *world of contradictions* that surrounds them', it probably doesn't make sense that <u>America</u> = 'One nation under God', yet these men who claim to be 'a <u>necessary</u>, divine <u>connection</u> to God' are <u>not allowed</u> (of course **openly** or **directly**) in the American government. But, after reading the previous *historical quotes* from leaders with *firsthand* knowledge and experience with these false prophets, we can now realize that they (with the exception of *Hitler*) were <u>ultimately</u> trying to <u>convey</u> that 'these <u>so-called holy men</u>, who supposedly spoke <u>for</u> God, were **really** some of the **greatest liars** ever', and that 'these false mediators <u>did **not**</u> speak **for God**, but **for themselves** (and of course **for Satan**) to <u>gain **sovereign rule**</u> over <u>multitudes</u> and <u>nations</u>, disquising that sovereign rule as being ruled by God'. Therefore, remembering that 'religion is manmade, while spirituality is God-made', it is possible, as the United States of America is 'living historical proof', to have, contrary to the assertions of our religious leaders, 'a blessed, prosperous, and *just* (at least in principle) <u>nation</u>' - noting here that any amount of <u>peace</u> still left in today's world is in

large part due to the creation of the United States - <u>without</u> 'religion being <u>intertwined</u> with government'; as God is <u>everywhere</u> and <u>omnipresent anyway</u>. And that's why it is 'One nation <u>under God</u>', <u>not</u> 'One nation <u>under Catholicism, Judaism, Protestantism, Islam</u>, etc.', as these are all <u>false gods</u> that <u>divide us</u>, and thereby <u>contradict</u> the <u>core</u> American ideal that '<u>We are one indivisible nation Only under one God</u>'.

Furthermore, we must realize that, <u>what</u> the <u>American Founders could not see</u> (making it America's fatal flaw or Achilles' heel) was that '<u>freedom of religion</u>' was actually 'the <u>freedom</u> to <u>worship false</u> <u>gods</u>'; which will <u>ultimately</u> (as we have <u>already</u> seen the <u>problems</u> arising in America for some time now) <u>destroy</u> 'a blessed, prosperous, and just nation' by <u>Secretly dividing</u> it from <u>within</u>... without us ever seeing or realizing it because we <u>cannot identify</u> our <u>religions</u> as being <u>false gods</u>.

And so again, as these historical figures no doubt <u>saw</u>, <u>felt</u>, and <u>experienced</u> the abuse of power and absolute power of governments under the (whether seen or unseen) control of the Catholic religion, it is no wonder that they essentially said 'You religious leaders are bold and arrogant liars who blindly speak for Satan, causing us to all live in absolute misery, therefore we don't want you anywhere <u>near</u> our government or laws, as you <u>don't</u> really represent **God**, but rather <u>Satan'</u>; with of course Catholicism, after say 'the French Revolution and the American Revolution', essentially trying to play the <u>role</u> of 'helpless, persecuted victim' (of course drawing on the persecution of early Christians), while it was the Catholic hierarchy who had been (and still were) the brutal torturers (again reminding ourselves of the *brutal, unspeakable torture techniques* used in the <u>Inquisitions</u>). To emphasize the <u>sadistic</u> nature of the Catholic Church's torturous and demented spiritual slavery and oppression that still exists, hidden in the unseen realm, it helps here to draw a parallel between the Catholic hierarchy and the brutal Nazi dictator, Adolf Hitler, who also strived to have for himself absolute power and world domination, and is 'the face for abuse of power' in our present time. Hitler admired the Catholic **Church's hierarchy**, who are **masters** at 'inflicting **mind manipulation** tactics of **fear** and **quilt** on their own people to ensure loyalty and submission' (much resembling Hitler's fascist regime). And just like the Catholic hierarchy of past centuries (i.e., the <u>Dark Ages</u>), Hitler employed <u>brutal physical torture</u>, in addition to his 'mind manipulation tactics of fear and guilt', to make people submit to his authority. Hitler did all this in the name of 'cleansing' and the promise of 'prosperity, stability, and unity'; that is, he did all this in the name of **false peace**. Now, the Catholic hierarchy promises all of the same things as Hitler; 'cleansing, prosperity, stability, and unity'... or false peace. But the only difference is that, the evil (speaking in terms of today, in the unseen, spiritual realm) that is at the core of the Catholic Church is <u>much more deceptive</u> than <u>Hitler's Openly brutal</u> tactics. That is, Hitler threatened all who did not submit with **physical** death, while the **present** Catholic hierarchy threatens all who do not submit with eternal spiritual death. And today's Catholic hierarchy (the wolf in sheep's clothing) makes people submit to their authority by the **seemingly** peaceable and **innocent** actions of their Sacraments, in particular the **Eucharist**; yet, as this text proves, the **Eucharist** is the **root** of **worldwide desolation** both <u>past</u> and <u>present</u>, with <u>nothing peaceable</u> or <u>innocent about it</u>. Hence, the Catholic hierarchy may play 'the helpless, persecuted victim or lamb', but their brutal torturous methods (both physically in the

<u>concentration camp</u> where they conduct silent inquisitions and spiritual prison' (i.e., an <u>unseen concentration camp</u> where they conduct silent inquisitions and spiritual torture) still very much ultimately causes 'absolute misery'... with this misery being disguised with words like 'cleansing, prosperity, stability, unity, and of course love and peace', spoken from behind 'what people think is Jesus': the Eucharist, which is responsible for the MOST physical and spiritual brutality that the world has ever seen. And so we must realize that the Eucharist is at the core of Satan's fascist, puppet regime, (i.e., the Catholic Church), and it is 'the means' by which he acts as 'the ultimate worldwide dictator'... ultimately realizing that Hitler pales in comparison to the Evil One who is hidden behind the beautifully deceptive façade of 'the Catholic Church and the Eucharist' (remembering that both of these puppets are named 'Jesus' to easily deceive the multitudes).

And so Satan (as mirrored in many of his 'blind religious puppet regimes') operates indirectly in the <u>hidden realm</u> so that his <u>influence</u> over 'life, law, and liberty' is <u>hard to trace</u>. Satan is wise beyond all measure in 'ways of planting seeds of deception'; remembering that he has over 6000 years of experience. Therefore Satan gets his unknowing servants, the religious leaders, to 'plant seeds (usually in the form of <u>biblical misinterpretation</u>) that <u>may not even sprout</u> until a <u>few generations</u> have passed', so that his seeds are undetectable to the present generation in which they are sown. So it must be recognized that, while a priest (or any religious leader) may have a PhD in theology, it does not mean that he has the slightest understanding of Satan's unfathomable ability to deceive and betray; as a priest does not understand that 'Satan <u>uses him</u> to <u>plant seeds</u> that may <u>only sprout after</u> he is <u>dead</u> and gone'. In other words, because a priest does not 'know the darkness' and Satan's <u>ability</u> to deceive in the hidden realm disquised as Jesus, he will mistake 'Satan's false light (or darkness)' as being 'true light', thereby blindly and unknowingly 'spreading Satan's darkness' while truly believing that he is 'spreading Jesus' light'. Think here of blindly 'spreading the evil idea' that (through of course gross biblical misinterpretation) 'it is good and righteous to break God's Primary Commandment by bowing to and serving the Eucharist, a false idol'. As Isaiah 5.20 says 'Woe to those who say that darkness is actually light'. So we must realize that, in order for someone to 'know and understand what is true light', they must first 'know and understand what is true darkness', thereby being able to truly <u>decipher</u> one from another, and **identify** 'Satan's <u>redefinition</u> of good and evil'... remembering here that 'Satan's tree in the Garden of Eden' represented 'a false version of good and evil'. To further explain, it helps to recall the Chinese proverb that says, "What I read I forget, what I see I remember, and what **Ido I know**". A **book**, or 'what you <u>read</u>', is only the **beginning** of knowledge. <u>Reading</u> is forgotten, reading becomes a 'jumbled mess' in your mind, and 'knowledge from reading' is skewed by other people's interpretations. Therefore, as true knowledge and understanding only comes from 'doing', 'knowledge from reading' is not true knowledge; i.e., 'What I read I don't know, but what I do **I know**'. Now we all <u>read</u> from the <u>same book</u>, the <u>Bible</u>, but <u>until</u> you have actually <u>lived</u> (or '<u>done</u>') the life of 'an innocent Man condemned to death', you do not 'know' the true knowledge and meaning of 'the death and resurrection of Christ'. Or, you do not 'know' until you have 'done'. This means that, if priests have never known the total darkness, death, and emptiness of an entire world turned against

them, just as Jesus knew, how can they possibly say that they know the light? That is, it is impossible for a priest, or any religious leader, to (fully) understand 'what they have read in the Bible' until they know the darkness firsthand, actually living, just as Jesus lived, 'the journey across a sea of darkness to save people who hate you with passion'. Hence a priest has only read about the darkness; he does not know the darkness. And if a priest, or any religious leader, does not know the darkness, then Satan can easily trick him into believing that 'the darkness is actually the light'. So 'a PhD in reading', such as a priest's PhD in theology, is very **different** than 'a PhD in knowing', as not having lived and known the darkness that Christ 'lived and knew', a priest's definition of 'the darkness' is easily <u>skewed</u> by other people's (mis)interpretations; or by what he reads. This of course means that 'a priest's PhD in man-made knowledge and wisdom' (or 'a PhD in reading') does not qualify him to know the first thing about 'the death (i.e., absolute darkness) and resurrection of Christ', thereby not being **qualified** in the 'true knowledge of Christ'. Thus 'a PhD in reading' means that you can repeat 'what others have written' like a **parrot**, while 'a PhD in knowing' gives you the understanding to **decipher** whether or not 'what others have written' is true or false, thereby being qualified in true knowledge. 'A PhD in knowing' gives you the understanding to decipher - or 'to know' - 'true darkness' from 'true light'; regardless of other people's misinterpretations. And so, religious leaders, in particular the Catholic hierarchy, must realize that, because they have Never known true darkness, they (consequently not knowing true knowledge) walk around repeating (as Satan's blind parrots) biblical misinterpretations that they have been taught through receiving 'a PhD in reading', not realizing that they are spreading **Satan's darkness** that he disguises as **Jesus' light**, thereby being his **unknowing** servants who plant seeds that ultimately (in the future) sprout to cause widespread 'division, war, and hate'.

As Paul says, "Satan (an angel of <u>darkness</u>) <u>disquises</u> himself to <u>appear as</u> an angel of <u>light</u>" (2
Corinthians 11.14). So by <u>disguising</u> his <u>darkness</u> as <u>light</u>, Satan has <u>easily tricked</u> Catholic priests and scholars (who 'do not know' or 'have never experienced' true darkness) throughout the centuries into <u>misinterpreting</u> Jesus' words - such as 'Jesus <u>instructed</u> us to <u>make a false idol</u>, the <u>Eucharist</u>', blatantly disregarding the Primary Commandment - thereby <u>rewriting</u> 'the book on Jesus'... that is, <u>changing</u>

Jesus' intentions in order to <u>redefine Jesus' entire existence</u>. Here we must realize that <u>words</u>

written on a page (i.e., 'what you <u>read</u>') are <u>not alive</u>, so it is a <u>lie</u> for priests and scholars to <u>assert</u> that they 'know' every 'inflection and intention' of every word that Jesus <u>physically spoke</u>. Think of the frequency with which people <u>Verbally Speak</u> in 'a <u>sarcastic tone'</u>, saying one thing, but <u>meaning</u> the <u>total opposite</u>. So, aside from Jesus speaking almost exclusively in <u>figurative language</u> (using purely figurative, symbolic words such as <u>flesh</u>, <u>blood</u>, and <u>body</u>; see Sections 7&8), we must also understand that He purposefully used 'a <u>sarcastic tone'</u> with the <u>arrogant Pharisees</u> - who were always 'testing His knowledge and His intentions' - thereby meaning something <u>opposite</u> or <u>different</u> than 'what He actually said'. For example, after the Pharisees ask 'Why does Jesus eat with tax collectors and sinners', Jesus <u>sarcastically</u> replies to the Pharisees in Matthew 9.12, "Those who are well have no need of a

physician, but those who are sick", making it sound like He is eating with the tax collectors and other (by definition of the Pharisees) sinners because they are sick; although the following verse (13) reveals that the Pharisees, not (so much) the tax collectors and other 'supposed sinners', are 'the spiritually sick ones', placing 'sacrifices and rituals' (which equates to supremacy and exclusion) before 'simple kindness and mercy'. Thus, verses that may appear 'on paper' to mean one thing, actually mean something totally different and/or opposite when Verbally spoken by Jesus. That is, it is important to realize that, perceived 'vocal inflection and intention' of Jesus' words by a blind interpreter - such as a Catholic priest or scholar, who does not 'know the darkness' - can breathe false life into 'dead words' on a page, thereby leading to biblical misinterpretations that are then passed down as 'the truth of Christ', which of course rewrites 'the book on Jesus', and consequently redefines darkness as being light; noting here the perceived vocal inflections and intentions that we have been taught to associate with 'Eve and the serpent' (see Section 1), yielding opposite interpretations.

Now ultimately, the **reason** for Catholic priests and scholars **not correctly** interpreting Jesus' words (not 'knowing the darkness') is quite simply that 'they don't know who Jesus (the Light) really is'. That is, they have never met Christ to therefore know His true persona, thereby interpreting 'dead words written on a page' based on 'an opposite (anti-Christ) personality' conceived by Satan (the Antichrist), which of course yields opposite interpretations of Christ's words. As an example, consider if the words 'What are you doing here?' were written down and then read by someone unaware of the persona of 'the one who <u>originally</u> spoke the words'. This line <u>could</u> have <u>2 totally opposite</u> interpretations depending on the *inflection* and *intention* of the speaker. The <u>1</u>st: 'Hey friend, what brought you here? I did not expect to see you here, but I'm glad to see you anyway'. The **2nd**: 'Hey you, why are you here? You don't belong here! No one invited you.' So if you do not know the persona of 'the one who <u>verbally spoke</u> the original line' (<u>and/or</u> the line is <u>taken out of context</u>, which is discussed next), then your interpretation of the line - its 'inflection and intention' - will be wrong, and consequently you will breathe a false persona into 'the one who originally spoke the line'; which of course is what has happened to Jesus' persona, resulting in us following 'a (fictitious) Jesus that, resembling the Catholic Forefathers, never existed'. In addition to knowing the true identity or persona of a biblical figure (namely Jesus) in order to correctly interpret the 'inflection and intention' of a particular verse that they spoke, you must also know the **context** in which it was spoken. That is, the **context** in which a verse was spoken is **just as important** as the **verse itself** for an accurate interpretation. There are many verses spoken by Jesus that have been taken out of context by Catholic priests and scholars who never knew Jesus, thereby portraying Jesus to be 'concerned with something that He's <u>not</u> at all concerned with', and vice versa. I.e., many <u>Catholic interpretations</u> of particular verses do not make any sense with their Surrounding context. In particular, Jesus' words on <u>adultery</u> do not seem (according to Catholic doctrine) to make any sense in their <u>surrounding</u> context. This is so because, when Jesus spoke about adultery to the proud Pharisees - of course having a sarcastic tone - it was actually the Pharisees (just like all religious leaders today) who were the adulterers, 'blindly playing the harlot with Satan' (or even acting as 'a false husband standing in place of Satan'), thereby 'breaking their marriage covenant with God' (see Section 17). And so many people do not understand that when Jesus spoke about *adultery* to the proud Pharisees, it was meant as *figurative* language to describe their 'figurative adultery against God' (i.e., 'figurative adultery with Satan') or idolatry; realizing that this figurative adultery was on a macro level concerning large groups of people (i.e., nations), not an individual level, as is 'adultery between a man and a woman'... which of course has Wrongly portrayed Jesus as having 'a <u>harsh</u> and <u>strict</u> vocal inflection or tone' (at least even <u>stricter</u> than the Pharisees) toward 'individual, literal adultery', while in truth His vocal inflection or tone was 'harsh and strict' toward the Pharisees (not individual followers) for causing and participating in macro level, figurative adultery. Also note that, while the Pharisees would ask Jesus about 'literal adultery between a man and a woman' (see Matthew 19.3-9), Jesus would respond to them using figurative language (again, see Section 17), just as Jesus was speaking to the Samaritan woman about figurative <u>living water</u>, yet she <u>thought</u> that He was speaking about <u>literal water from the well</u> (see John 4.11-15). So by a combination of **both** 'taking verses out of context' and 'simply not knowing Jesus' true persona', Catholic priests and scholars throughout the centuries have falsely interpreted the 'inflections' and intentions' of Jesus' words on adultery as 'pertaining to the individual relationship between a man and a woman', when actually His words were 'pertaining to the macro level relationship between man (i.e., <u>humanity</u>) and <u>God</u>'; i.e., man's 'marriage covenant' with God. Hence, it is <u>irOnic</u> that, among many other religious leaders, Catholic priests and scholars preach on the pitfalls of 'individual adultery between a man and a woman' - something Jesus was not really concerned with at all (being 'a gnat compared to a camel') - while blindly (because of gross biblical misinterpretation) being the true adulterers, 'spiritually fornicating with Satan', thereby leading multitudes into macro level idolatry, 'bowing down to and serving the **Eucharist** and the **false** god, **Catholicism**'; making it obvious that Catholic priests and scholars (along with most religious leaders) have turned 'Jesus' words on adultery' into complete nonsense statements. Furthermore, by falsely interpreting the 'inflections and intentions' of **verbally** spoken words, Satan has **tricked** Catholic priests and scholars (i.e., false prophets) into breathing false life into 'the persona of Jesus' and other biblical figures (i.e., the true Prophets), thereby breathing false life into, or rewriting the Bible; noting that Catholic priests and scholars have been singled out from Protestant scholars because it was the early Catholic Forefathers or 'early Catholic scholars and theologians' who were initially responsible for creating 'a false persona for Jesus' and other biblical figures - which was then 'passed down' to unknowing Protestants. So, if Catholic priests and scholars, with their 'PhD in reading', have merely 'read what is in the Bible', yet not 'lived (or <u>done</u>) what is in the Bible', then their <u>understanding</u> of biblical figures, and <u>perception</u> of their personas, is 'what Satan wants them to understand and perceive', essentially creating in their minds 'a rewritten, false bible', full of fictitious biblical figures, which has then been taught to the multitudes, so that the entire world's understanding of the Bible (and consequently God) is actually *misunderstanding*. Think about it. Is this not what happened between Jesus and the religious leaders 2000 years ago, with all of the religious leaders claiming to 'know and honor the Prophets' and to 'know and honor God's laws' [see John 8.54-55 where Jesus says 'You Claim that My Father (capital

G, God) is your god, but you have never known the one true God'), while Jesus (the Truth) asserted that 'They were the descendants of those who killed the Prophets' (Matthew 23.31), and 'Not one of them obeyed God's laws' (John 7.19)?... which obviously also meant that the multitudes of people were essentially following 'a false version of the Bible' (based on gross misinterpretations) created by the religious leaders, leading to 'the entire world's supposed understanding of the Bible and God' actually being misunderstanding.

Now in today's world we may *naïvely* think that it is **not possible** for the entire world (**including** ourselves) to 'think that they understand the message of the Prophets and who God really is, while actually not understanding the Prophets and God at all', but thinking this is exactly what Satan wants. That is, Satan wants us to think that we have advanced far beyond those 'barbaric cavemen in the Old Testament' so that we are deceived (because of our pride) into believing it is impossible to have 'the <u>message</u> of the Prophets and the <u>understanding</u> of who God is and what He wants' <u>completely</u> backwards (i.e., opposite of what is true); noting that Isaiah 44.25 says that 'God turns wise men (i.e., our proud religious leaders) **backward**. But here we must remember that John opens his Gospel by essentially saying that 'Although the world was made through Jesus, and Jesus was in the world, the people of the world COUld not recognize Him'... obviously meaning that, as Jesus is 'the express image of God', then 'their perception or understanding of what God should be like' was completely backwards or opposite of 'who God actually was and what He actually wanted'. And so we should recognize that the Bible (in particular the **Old Testament**) is essentially a <u>recurring message</u> of God's true Prophets (which was usually a lone, minority voice) telling a majority of people (i.e., the entire world) that 'although they (i.e., their false prophets) claim to understand God, their understanding is actually misunderstanding'. Again, our only problem today is that, with a Bible staring us right in the face (although it is essentially 'a rewritten, false bible' by gross misinterpretations planted in our minds), we <u>can't fathom</u> that 'we could possibly be the <u>Same</u> barbaric cavemen (maybe worse) of the Old Testament', SWearing up and down to God's true Prophets (and Jesus) that 'We know and <u>understand</u> God', while we, just like people of Jesus' day, <u>could **not** even recognize Jesus</u> (the express image of God) if we stood right next to Him. Therefore, one of the most important things for us to do is simply **humble** ourselves and **accept** that it is **possible** (i.e., 'accept the truth' as in John 8.31-32) for Satan to truly have deceived and enslaved the whole world... including you. To do this we must:

- <u>A) humbly accept</u> that we may <u>not understand</u> (to varying degrees) <u>who</u> God, Jesus, or the true Prophets <u>are</u> at all, thereby *hating* and *misunderstanding* the message of a <u>true Prophet</u> in this <u>present day</u>, <u>just like</u> the multitudes in the Bible, because it <u>opposes</u> the message of the <u>false</u> <u>prophets</u> who began our religions (i.e., false gods),
- B) <u>humbly accept</u> that the *majority voice* of <u>well respected religious leaders</u> (i.e., false prophets) who have <u>taught</u> us our entire lives (*violating* the **New Covenant**) are the Same as any

majority voice of <u>false prophets</u> in the Bible, <u>opposing</u> and <u>rejecting</u> <u>God's true Prophets</u> and <u>Jesus</u> (i.e., the <u>minority voice</u>), while <u>truly believing</u> that they are <u>opposing</u> and <u>rejecting Satan</u>,

<u>C)</u> <u>humbly accept</u> that we, <u>just like</u> the multitudes in the Bible, have <u>blindly</u> (i.e., <u>'What is our iniquity'</u> from Jeremiah 16.10) <u>transgressed God's Primary Commandment</u>, <u>'making</u>, <u>serving</u>, and <u>bowing down to</u> the <u>idol of desolation</u> (i.e., the <u>Eucharist</u>)', which is (like all idolatry in the Bible) 'the <u>root</u> cause of widespread division, war, and hate', as we have created many <u>false</u> <u>gods</u> (because of the <u>lies</u> spoken from behind the <u>Eucharist</u>) that we <u>defend</u> as being 'the one true God', and

<u>D) humbly accept</u> that we, <u>just like</u> the multitudes in the Bible, were <u>born blind into our</u> <u>ancestor's *indelibly ingrained lies*</u>, which we have been <u>raised to believe</u> (by the teachings of 'our false prophets who don't think that they <u>are</u> false prophets') are the <u>truth</u>.

Therefore we must remember the saying that 'Most people sit around and wait for the truth to knock, and when the truth does knock, they say 'Go away, I'm waiting for the truth". This means that, the truth will do you no good if you never open the door and allow the truth in (always thinking, of course, that 'the truth could not possibly be the real truth'). And this means that, the truth will do you no good if you will not at least open your mind (or 'the door in your mind') to the possibility that 'you were born into a lie', just like the multitudes in the Bible. And so, just as in biblical times when a true Prophet (such as Jesus) confronted people (i.e., 'knocked at the doors of people's minds') with true, yet unfamiliar knowledge which would lead to 'true freedom, liberty, and peace', we too are being confronted with this true, yet unfamiliar knowledge. And then, just like today, the only price for this 'true freedom, liberty, and peace' (from the slavery and desolation caused by the lies of Satan), is to simply 'open our minds to the truth when the truth knocks', being simply willing to humbly accept that 'our understanding of God' (which is inherited from our blind religious forefathers who made gross biblical misinterpretations) could very well be misunderstanding.

As mentioned earlier, this <u>entire text</u> (i.e., the <u>truth</u> and <u>knowledge</u> of Jesus Christ) is '<u>the (figurative)</u> ark of God's salvation for the coming flood (i.e., the Great Tribulation)', with the Great Tribulation being a <u>worldwide correction</u>, and a <u>Cataclysmic event</u> that ultimately brings about <u>world</u> <u>peace</u>... by the <u>apocalypse</u> or <u>revealing</u> of 'the knowledge concerning <u>worldwide idolatry</u> that is <u>rooted</u> in the <u>Eucharist'</u>. And as many (i.e., religious leaders and various other world leaders) will <u>hate</u> this <u>truth</u> and <u>knowledge</u> (i.e., light), 'wanting to <u>stay in their beloved darkness</u> because their <u>deeds are evil'</u> (John 3.19-20), we must realize that this only <u>proves</u> in itself that these words are indeed true, as <u>people in places authority</u> always hated the message of <u>true Prophets</u>; who, as Jesus says in Matthew 5.9&12, are the <u>true peacemakers</u>. So we must recognize that, throughout the Old Testament, true Prophets such as Jeremiah (i.e., a <u>true peacemaker</u>) foretold of a <u>correction</u> by God in order to eventually attain <u>peace</u>. But, just as 'a <u>small child</u> does <u>not understand correction</u> from his or her <u>father</u>', people have <u>never understood</u> '<u>correction</u> from <u>God</u>'. Jeremiah 16.10-12 says 'When you show these people all these words and they say 'Why has God pronounced this great disaster (i.e., correction) on us' or

'What is our sin', you shall say 'Because you have worshipped **false gods** and <u>not kept God's</u> **Commandments**". So we must understand that the people in **biblical times**, just as the people **today** will, insisted that 'they were doing nothing wrong' because they were 'born blind' into idolatry i.e., they knew nothing else from the earliest ages of life - truly believing that 'the qod (or false persona of God) that they followed' was the one true God. In other words, the real truth had been hidden from their eyes by the Evil One their entire lives, so that they thought, when hearing unfamiliar knowledge for the first time from a true Prophet, that 'the <u>real truth</u> was a <u>lie</u>', and that 'their <u>inherited lies</u> were actually the truth'. And because of these mental barriers that Satan placed in their minds from childhood, it was therefore impossible for them to attain peace with their current warped understanding of God's true persona (or belief that 'their false god was the one true God'). As Jesus says in Luke 19.42, "If you had known in this, your day, the things that make for peace, but now they are hidden from your eyes". Thus, the corrections from God - that were foretold of by the true Prophets were an attempt to open people's eyes to the truth (or liberate their minds from the slavery of their inherited lies) so that they could live in peace. But, because of pride in their inherited lies, the people, stiffening their necks, remained blind, and they 'could not see the things that made for peace in their **OWN** day'. This ultimately means that, if we continue to 'pray for peace', yet (even after being faced with the **Great Tribulation** or 'correction from God') we **proudly** will not 'accept the truth' (John 8.31-32) - which is written in this text concerning the worldwide idolatry that is rooted in the Eucharist - then we are **blindly repeating history**, and blindly repeating the **same mistakes** as those in the Bible, not 'seeing the things that make for <u>peace</u> in our <u>own day</u>'. And so again, this entire text is written, for all those who 'hear and <u>believe</u>', as 'an <u>ark of God's salvation</u> for the <u>coming flood</u> (i.e., the <u>Great Tribulation</u>)', as this 'flood' or correction MUST OCCUT in order to bring about world peace.

Now understanding and realizing that the true Prophets in the Old Testament, who were true peacemakers (noting that the false prophets always proclaimed 'a message of false peace', as being <u>enslaved</u> to them ultimately causes <u>War</u>), all had their '<u>message of true peace</u>' rejected by the majority of people around them, should the majority of people (in particular Catholic priests and scholars) in today's world not pause, and think before rejecting 'this message of true peace', learning from mistakes of our ancestors? That is, considering the history written in the Bible (remembering that the Bible is a history book, not 'a book of spiritual spells') concerning 'our ancestor's <u>reluctance</u> to <u>listen</u> to that <u>small, unfamiliar minority voice of the true Prophets</u>' (remembering that God usually speaks as 'a small, still voice' as per 1 Kings 19.12), we would be wise to pause and think before rejecting this message, hearing and trying to understand all of the evidence that proves this message as being 'the truth of God', thereby having the good sense to 'see and accept the things that make for **peace** in **OUR OWN day**'. If we don't hear and consider all of this **evidence**, then we must know that we have not progressed in our thinking and reasoning in thousands of years, staying closedminded (while many will double mindedly claim to be 'open-minded freethinkers') to the truth of God that sets us free to live in peace. If we don't hear and consider all of this evidence, then we must know that we have <u>not progressed</u> in our *thinking* and *reasoning* in <u>thousands</u> of years, holding blindly and

intolerantly (as *unknowing religious bigots*) to 'a *religious creed*' (i.e., a *false god*) of which we don't even know the true origins [as anything that happened on this earth before we were born can easily be <u>skewed</u> (as it's been said 'History is a set of lies agreed upon') by biased history books]... realizing that we hold blindly and intolerantly to religious creeds merely because they are inherited and 'all we have ever known'. So we should not be proud like the Pharisees of Jesus' day, thinking that 'We rigidly and absolutely know the truth beyond a shadow of a doubt'. We should not be the Pharisee who 'sat in the front of the church, so sure of his own righteousness', remembering that because many Jews were <u>so proud</u> of their 'inherited lies that they thought were the truth', they remained 'spiritually <u>blind</u>', thereby *arrogantly* and *blindly* <u>rejecting</u> Jesus' message of <u>freedom</u> and <u>peace</u> in order to remain in <u>slavery</u> (see Luke 4.18-29 and John 8.31-59); meaning that, if we <u>blindly reject this message of</u> freedom and peace, then we are proudly and arrogantly choosing to remain a slave, even when offered freedom... just as the people of Jesus' day. And so the only price for true peace (of course having true equality and true freedom first) is the humility to simply say 'Satan deceived me', just as he deceived Eve; of course, contrary to Adam and Eve, then conceding to Christ's true knowledge, not opting to wear *fig leaves* saying 'We have done nothing wrong'. The only price for true **peace** is the **humility** to concede that it is possible that 'our religious forefathers have passed down lies that are disguised as the truth'... humbly considering all of the evidence in this text. Consider here if you had all the evidence you needed to prove your innocence, and then you came before a **COrrupt judge**, and he said 'I <u>already know</u> the truth, and I say you are <u>guilty</u>'. Would you not be <u>furious</u> that he would not *hear* and *consider* all of the clear **evidence** proving your innocence? And so it is imperative that we <u>not be like the corrupt judge</u> who will not listen to and consider all of the clear evidence, arrogantly thinking that 'We already know the truth beyond a shadow of a doubt'... even though we are talking about events that happened thousands of years ago, and have therefore been skewed and mangled by **2000 years** of 'opinions of men', whose only interests lied in controlling others with 'the <u>name</u> and <u>false image</u> of Christ' (i.e., the <u>Eucharist</u>). Thus, realizing that Satan's clever <u>lies</u> have been, since childhood, 'planted (by our corrupt religious forefathers) in our minds' as being the truth, the only way that we will be able to come to a 'just verdict', realizing the truth, is to objectively and humbly hear and consider all of the clear evidence (not blindly rejecting this message as our ancestors did to past Prophets), as objectively and humbly hearing, considering, and understanding all of the clear evidence is the only way for us to ever find true world peace and true world freedom.

At this point, surely many will say 'How is it possible that the entire world, especially the entire Catholic hierarchy (who claim to hold 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven'), is held in bondage or captivity, and does not even know it?' So here we should consider 'an animal born into captivity'. All the animal has ever known are 'the four walls of a Cage', with the cage thereby becoming normalized to them.

Therefore, quite simply, people are no different. That is, when we are born into 'spiritual, mental, and emotional bondage or captivity', we accept it as normal; even though to some 'on the outside' it may seem harsh and abnormal. And oddly enough, even when the people in bondage are told that 'they are in bondage' and then offered freedom, they either can't believe it (because their enslavement is normal)

and 'all they have ever known'), or are too afraid and fearful to leave their captor, of course having been <u>threatened</u> with <u>death</u> (either <u>spiritual</u> or <u>physical</u>); remembering here that, <u>Moses</u> spoke words of <u>freedom</u> and <u>liberty</u> to the Israelites, 'but they <u>did not heed</u> Moses because of <u>anguish of spirit</u> and cruel bondage' (Exodus 6.9). Hence, since many devout Catholics (as well as Muslims, other Christians, etc.) have had 'the fear of eternal death' indelibly ingrained deep into their subconscious minds to ensure allegiance to the Catholic hierarchy (of course thereby having 'anguished spirits' and living entire lives in 'cruel spiritual and mental bondage'), they too will 'not be able to (hopefully just at first) <u>heed</u>' this message of <u>true freedom</u>. Now here we must realize that, in <u>recent</u> times, Catholicism's prison or cage is one without physical walls, existing only in our minds, thereby making it much harder to identify. And so 'the <u>cruel bondage</u> set up by the Catholic Forefathers' (i.e., the <u>enslavement</u> of multitudes to themselves, disguised as 'serving Jesus' by using the Eucharist, a false Jesus), and then passed down through the generations, is <u>much more deceptive</u> than the **Egyptians**, as the Israelites could actually 'see and feel', in the physical realm, their imprisonment. Note also that, since Catholics are <u>enslaved</u> to the Catholic hierarchy by 'the Catholic hierarchy making people <u>wrongly believe</u> that they are actually serving Jesus', many Catholics have consequently have their minds warped into actually **protecting their captors**, the **Catholic hierarchy**, as they have made themselves 'one with Christ'. We must also recognize that <u>Jesus</u>, <u>like Moses</u>, tried to tell His own people 'a message of freedom and liberty' (i.e., the New Covenant itself), but instead of accepting it, they, essentially protecting their captors (the Jewish hierarchy and their forefathers), rejected (i.e., would 'not heed') His words, wanting to throw Jesus over a cliff (Luke 4.18-29) for implying that they were 'blind prisoners'. And so Jesus (essentially) told His own people that, because they were born into 'a cage of inherited lies', they lived in complacent, normalized bondage, and did not even know it. Jesus told His own people that they were essentially 'institutionalized' - just as someone who has been in physical prison for a long time - and were therefore (due to their inherited lies which threatened them with eternal damnation for leaving the false god 'Judaism') subconsciously fearful of true freedom and true independence. I.e., Satan's ability to <u>redefine right</u> and <u>wrong</u> tells our minds that 'it is <u>wrong</u> to leave his false gods that were set up by our blind ancestors'. Thus, Jesus told His own people that they lived in a normalized prison (or normalized bondage) which they had inherited from their ancestors - i.e., they were born into a 'normalized cage' - and they did not even know it; making us realize that it is easily quite possible in today's world (and is in fact very real) that the entire world lives in complacent, normalized bondage ... especially when you consider that the 1st and Primary Commandment concerning idolatry pertains to 'the Israelites' bondage in Egypt', and the entire world (whether knowingly or unknowingly) bows to 'Catholicism's idol of desolation and enslavement': the Eucharist.

And so the simple fact is that <u>nothing</u> has <u>changed</u> in <u>2000 years</u>. We, that is 'the entire world', <u>still</u> live in (just as in Jesus' day) a '<u>normalized cage'</u>, <u>subconsciously fearful</u> of <u>true freedom</u> and <u>true independence</u>; and we don't even know it because, like an <u>animal</u> born into <u>captivity</u>, <u>we too</u> were <u>born into captivity</u>, <u>not knowing</u> 'any other way'. Now this essentially means that, <u>We are institutionalized</u>, being born into 'the <u>prisons</u> of our <u>religions or churches'</u>, and are therefore <u>fearful</u> to <u>leave</u> them; just as <u>an inmate</u> is <u>afraid</u> to <u>leave</u> prison because '<u>the prison'</u>' represents '<u>man-</u>

made security and structure'. Realize here that Satan's mind manipulation games create in our minds a sense that 'our churches (which house Satan's false gods) are our homes (i.e., security and structure)', thereby inflicting the <u>fear</u> in our **institutionalized minds** that 'to leave our **church** is to essentially leave our home'. But our churches are actually false homes (or 'a false mother figure' in the case of Catholicism). So just as a *prison* is 'a *figurative crutch for an inmate*', so too have 'our churches or religions' (which are spiritual prisons) become our figurative crutches that 'keep us from walking on our own two feet' and realizing true freedom as God intended with the institution of the New Covenant... which is our *freedom* and *independence* from <u>false mediators</u>. And this is so because the <u>crutches</u> that we have all been 'spiritually walking with our entire lives' have been sold or prescribed to us by our ancestors as being 'righteous and good' (remembering that 'Satan's tree of false knowledge' redefines good and evil) in order to guarantee 'our subservience to them and their institutions'. Furthermore this is so because our <u>crutches</u> have been <u>normalized</u> by <u>generations</u> of *false prophets* and <u>degenerative</u> theologians of (mainly) the Catholic religion who have lusted after supremacy and authority; remembering here that our 'weekly prescribed obligations to attend Mass or worship service' have been skillfully attached to the 3rd Commandment in order for our religious leaders (and ultimately Satan) to keep us **fearful** of **leaving** our **enslavement** to them. So in other words, our *crutches* have been normalized so that 'our religious (particularly Catholic) forefathers and their modern day descendants' can play the role of 'spiritual physician' (while actually being 'spiritual hacks'), with us as 'patient', in order to make us **believe** that we are **sick** and 'in need of their so-called healing abilities'. But We are not sick, and we do not need their normalized crutches. The fact is that we have been able to walk our entire lives, and these - the inherited man-made ideas that 'we are sick and lame without the aid of our false spiritual physicians and their prescribed crutches' - are all just lies passed down by (in large part) the Catholic Forefathers to imprison and enslave us. And, these inherited <u>lies</u> (or ancestral sin; see Section 13) that have been passed down to us from the Catholic Forefathers, keep us blind (as they have deceptively been spoken from behind the Eucharist, a false Jesus) to the truth so that we are blind prisoners protecting Satan, our captor, while truly believing that we are protecting Jesus, our <u>Savior</u>; thinking here how <u>difficult</u> it is to 'free people who think (because of lies) that they are already free'. These inherited lies keep us blind so that we reject true freedom and true liberty - just as Jesus' own people did 2000 years ago - in order to remain prisoners in our normalized cages to Satan, who has tricked us into believing that 'we are somehow slaves to Christ'. Thus, in order to <u>not</u> stay in the <u>rut</u> of '<u>continually repeating history</u>' over and over again, blindly rejecting 'Jesus' message of freedom and liberty' (i.e., the New Covenant itself), we must lay our egos aside and simply tell God that 'Satan has deceived us' (Genesis 3.13)... of course then (contrary to Adam and Eve) humbly conceding to and embracing true knowledge, not trying to 'cover our ignorance with <u>fig leaves</u>'. So having the <u>true humility</u> - not the <u>false humility</u> of 'honoring God with our words' - to admit and <u>accept</u> that our *religious forefathers and leaders, parents, grandparents,* and *ancestors* have <u>blindly</u> passed on Satan's deceptive <u>lies</u> and *false* knowledge (i.e., '<u>dirt'</u> covering over the <u>root</u> of our enslavement, the **Eucharist**), is the only way for us to leave our **captivity** and be **truly free**, destroying the institutionalized mentality that has enslaved us our entire lives. That is, simply 'accepting (not

<u>telling</u>) the <u>truth will set us free</u>' (John 8.31-32)... which means that the <u>only price</u> for *freedom* and *liberty* is again simply the <u>humility</u> to <u>admit</u> and <u>accept</u> that 'we have <u>inherited</u>, from our religious forefathers, <u>lies</u> that are <u>cleverly</u> <u>disquised</u> (with the <u>name</u> and <u>false image</u> of Jesus) as being <u>truth</u>'.

One of the hardest concepts for many 'religious followers' to fathom is, the knowledge and wisdom (being eaten from 'Satan's tree of <u>false knowledge</u> and <u>false wisdom</u>') that 'religious <u>leaders</u>' so eloquently speak (using reverent blasphemy) is actually nonsense and man-made wisdom (i.e., lies cleverly disguised as truth), which is usually propagated by religious leaders for their continued <u>authority</u> over the multitudes. In other words, 'the <u>continued enslavement</u> of people' is <u>perpetuated</u> by false knowledge that sounds like true knowledge. So while religious leaders may seem knowledgeable and wise, having 'a lifetime of experience in reading the Bible' (i.e., having 'a PhD in reading'), and therefore being well practiced and <u>fluent</u> in 'the <u>language</u> of the Bible', we must know that they have merely become experts at 'forming sentences', with no real (macro level) logic or wisdom behind their words. But since the *majority* of *followers* are much *like 'foreigners* in a strange land', who are <u>not</u> <u>fluent</u> in 'the <u>language</u> of the Bible', many are <u>baffled</u> and <u>taken advantage of</u> (just as the <u>foreigner</u> is taken advantage of) by the Speech of our religious leaders; which, make no mistake, is very good and <u>Very convincing</u>, convincing us to be '<u>thankful</u> for <u>our enslavement</u> to <u>them</u>', and even <u>convincing</u> themselves that (ironically) 'they are actually serving us and God'; noting that Paul, in 1 Corinthians 2.1 says, 'I did not come to you with excellence of speech'. Now this means that 'the supposedly knowledgeable and wise religious leaders' are, in terms of Jesus' simple truths, actually quite ignorant (or *figuratively naked*), staying <u>blind</u> (because of their <u>pride</u>) to <u>true</u> knowledge and wisdom. Or in other words, *true* knowledge is <u>hidden</u> from them because of 'the <u>pride</u> they have in their <u>false</u>, <u>man-made</u>, fallible knowledge'. To further explain, the religious leaders (in particular the Catholic hierarchy and their forefathers) have proudly 'sworn oaths' that 'their knowledge is absolutely and rigidly infallible' (putting 'disordered trust' in their false, man-made knowledge to support their continued kingship), thereby being bound (by pride) to protect and stand by (i.e., place fig leaves over) that knowledge when it is shown to be false knowledge, in turn creating and propagating to future generations 'great doctrinal error' (which equates to a false god) that is 'proudly sworn by' (i.e., people put disordered trust in it) as being absolute, infallible **truth**, consequently (again because of **pride**) keeping <u>true</u> knowledge and wisdom <u>hidden</u> from 'the <u>supposedly</u> knowledgeable and wise religious leaders'. So here we can truly see how <u>pride</u> and <u>disordered trust</u> in the man-made knowledge of our ancestors (i.e., our religious sacred traditions) is quite blinding (which is why Jesus says in Matthew 5.34 '<u>Don't swear any oaths at all'</u>), and that the <u>true humility</u> - not the <u>false humility</u> of 'the Pope's <u>feet</u> washings and feet kissings' (knowing that his humility will be shown as false when his kingship is threatened) - to 'accept and concede to the true knowledge of Christ' (John 8.31-32) is the only way to gain full sight and be truly clothed. Now this - i.e., the idea that 'the proud and supposedly prudent and wise religious leaders are **blindly peddling** man-made nonsense (to of course perpetuate their hidden kingships), with <u>humility</u> being the only path to the <u>true knowledge</u> of Christ' - is why Jesus says in **Luke 20.21**, 'Father, I thank You because You have <u>shown to the humble and unlearned</u> what You have

hidden from the eyes of the proud and learned (i.e., the wise and knowledgeable)'. As Isaiah 44.25 says 'God turns wise men backward, and makes their (absolutely infallible) knowledge into foolishness'; with Paul saying 'The thoughts of the wise are futile, and so God catches the wise in their own craftiness, destroying the wisdom of the wise, and bringing to nothing the (supposed) understanding of the prudent' (1 Corinthians 3.19-20 and 1.19). So we must know that, as much as our proud religious leaders have claimed to have true knowledge, their knowledge, no matter how eloquent and persuasive their words appear to be (having been sworn by God's name and heaven itself), is actually false knowledge and foolishness, with pride and disordered trust in 'the supposedly sacred doctrine and tradition of their ancestors' (which is of course centered around the Eucharist) keeping them from seeing (as 'God hides from and resists the proud'; 1 Peter 5.5) their foolishness and figurative nakedness. Think about it, if the apocalypse is 'a revealing of true knowledge that is now hidden', then it follows that 'the knowledge our religious leaders are presently preaching must be false knowledge'... otherwise there would be no need for the apocalypse.

Here it is quite <u>ironic</u> to note that the <u>Catholic Bishop Fulton Sheen</u> (considered as one of the <u>supposedly</u> *wise* and *learned* scholars or theologians of the Catholic religion) wrote:

"Holy Child, our Redeemer, free us from our disordered trust in our own knowledge, will, and abilities".

We must wonder though, does <u>Bishop Sheen</u> (although presently *dead*) and the rest of the Catholic hierarchy <u>really want</u> to be <u>freed</u> from 'the <u>disordered trust</u> that they have put in their <u>own knowledge</u> and abilities (i.e. their 'ability' to fabricate the Eucharist)', or are they just like the proud Pharisees and Scribes of Jesus' day, 'honoring God with words', yet not willing to humbly accept God's correction of 'their false, defiled, and highly fallible knowledge and abilities'? And so it is quite ironic that Bishop **Sheen** would write this (quite eloquent) petition, when it was the Catholic Forefathers' disordered trust in their own man-made knowledge and wisdom which led to the creation of 'the greatest and most deceptive false idol ever known to mankind' (of course, the Eucharist), with Bishop Sheen and countless other indelibly ingrained descendants of the Catholic Forefathers of course propagating that false manmade knowledge; again for the continued enslavement of humanity to themselves. This means that, for the Catholic hierarchy to truly be 'free from the disordered trust that they have placed in their own knowledge, will, and abilities', they must 'open the door when Jesus (the Redeemer) knocks with the truth', humbly (not with the false humility of 'honoring God with words and rituals') 'accepting the truth' (John 8.31-32) that 'they are in fact descendants in a long line of wicked and deceitful idolaters'... while they have **believed**, for an entire lifetime, that 'they are <u>descendants</u> in a long line of <u>holy</u> and virtuous Saints'. But unfortunately for some of the Catholic hierarchy, they - just like the Jews that Jesus spoke to in John 8.33, who proudly believed that 'they could not possibly be blind slaves to sin and error because of their <u>lineage</u> to <u>Abraham</u>' - will struggle to believe (also because of the **pride** and **stiff-necked** arrogance rooted in their lineage and sacred tradition) that 'the very COTE of their religion (i.e., the

Eucharist) is the **source** of their <u>sin</u>, and the **source** of <u>worldwide sin'</u>, and that 'they **too** are **blind slaves** to sin and error'. As Jesus says in Matthew 13.15, 'For the hearts of this people have grown dull. Their ears are hard of hearing, and their eyes they have closed. But if they could see, hear, and understand with their hearts, then God would heal them'. Therefore, the Catholic hierarchy will not be healed and **free** of the **false** knowledge that has **enslaved** them and the whole world **until** they **open** their **eyes** and their ears, and unharden their hearts to the truth. I.e., 'humbly accepting and conceding to (or abiding in) the truth will set the Catholic hierarchy free' (John 8.31-32), healing their deranged minds. The <u>Catholic hierarchy</u> will not be <u>healed</u> and <u>free</u> of the <u>false knowledge</u> that has <u>enslaved</u> them and the whole world <u>until</u> they are willing to 'truly believe in the real Jesus', leaving and opposing **everything** (i.e., the inherited lies) that they have **ever** been **taught** by their **forefathers**; just as Jesus' Apostles (Matthew 4.22 and Luke 5.11) and Saul left and opposed everything that they had ever been taught by their forefathers. And the Catholic hierarchy will not be healed and free of the false knowledge that has enslaved them and the whole world until they humbly accept God's answer to Bishop Sheen's petition... even though it's **not** the answer they thought it would be! Remember, "With God nothing is impossible" (Luke 1.37)... or has the Catholic hierarchy already set up infallible limits on 'what is possible'.

Now all of this means that, as many times as the **supposedly** infallible, wise, knowledgeable, prudent, holy, virtuous, and Christ-like Catholic hierarchy Chants, in sacred assembly, the name of Christ, the fact is that they are simply 'the descendants of those who killed Christ' (see Matthew 23.31); of course meaning that the Catholic hierarchy (and all the other religious hierarchies and governmental leaders who have unknowingly fallen under their influence or hidden kingship are actually highly fallible, nonsensical, ignorant, foolish, defiled, unrighteous, and <u>blindly **Satan-like**</u> (i.e., <u>anti-Christ</u>) just like Adam and Eve, and therefore just as **guilty** as their ancestors of 'brutally and sadistically **torturing and murdering Christ'**. Additionally, by 'stealing the **innocent** name of Christ, and speaking lies from behind the Eucharist (the idol that Causes desolation from Matthew 24.15)', the Catholic hierarchy is in fact **guilty** of **causing** and **directly participating in** nearly **2000** years of worldwide 'division, war, and hate' (i.e., dissension, judgment, oppression, slavery, torture, murder, starvation, homelessness, hopelessness, and overall desolation and human cruelty), being guilty of some of the worst and most heinous crimes against humanity; all while hiding behind 'the innocent name of Jesus' and 'a false image of Jesus (i.e., the Eucharist)', which has been disguised (by '<u>dirt'</u>) as 'an <u>innocuous</u> and <u>harmless piece of bread</u> associated (in <u>name</u> only) with Jesus' Last Supper'... but make no mistake, the **Eucharist** is the *greatest* and *most deceptive* false idol and Trojan horse humanity has ever seen. And so if you think that the foundation (i.e., the fundamental, core <u>doctrine</u>) of the Catholic Church is 'built on rock' (being spoken by the very convincing, and supposedly wise, holy, and Christ-like Catholic hierarchy), then you should check the 'facts' written in the Bible (which are <u>as close to factual</u> as we have); realizing that, by <u>not knowing</u> 'the <u>language</u> of the Bible', we

are like 'foreigners in a strange land', not knowing the language, and thereby being 'taken advantage of'. So we should not assume that we know the facts or 'the language' just because 'We read the Bible in 3rd grade', or because 'We listen to Scripture and Catholic (mis)interpretation every week in Mass'. The fact is (as **proven** in this text) that, we have only been - by **baffling**, very convincing, reverently blasphemous speech - lulled into a stupor by the blind Catholic interpreters, and of course all of their cathedrals, vestments, and golden chalices that lock down all of our visual senses, making us easily <u>subservient</u> to them; which is exactly the <u>complacent bondage</u> (or 'normalized cage') that Satan hopes to keep us in. In Acts 13.27 we see that 'because the Jewish interpreters of the Law were also acting as blind leaders of the blind', the people were unable to see or hear that the Truth Himself had arrived to set them free from their bondage. I.e., the Jewish people 2000 years ago, just like the people today, were <u>lulled into a stupor</u> and <u>held captive</u> by the <u>inherited lies</u> propagated by their blind religious leaders (spoken of course from the power position of a *finely adorned temple*). Acts 13.27 says, "For the people who live in Jerusalem and their leaders did not know that He is the Savior, nor did they **understand** the **words** of the Prophets that are **read every Sabbath**. Yet they made the Prophets' words come true by <u>condemning Jesus</u>". This means that, <u>even though</u> the people 2000 years ago <u>read</u> 'the <u>prophecies</u> concerning the Messiah' <u>every Sabbath</u>, they <u>could not recognize</u> that the prophecies were written about them and their execution of the Son of God. Likewise, Catholics sit in Mass every week and have no idea that it is their own Catholic religion that was prophesied about by Daniel, Jesus, and Jesus' Revelation to John. Likewise, Catholics sit in Mass every week and have no idea that 'it is the **Eucharist** that was prophesized as being the Abomination of Desolation'. Likewise, Catholics sit in Mass every week and have no idea that 'the Eucharist is the prophesized Image of the Beast' and 'the Catholic Church itself is the prophesized Beast', which deceives the whole world into unknowingly worshipping Satan (the one who grants authority to the Beast). <u>Likewise</u>, Catholics sit in Mass <u>every week</u> and have <u>no idea</u> that 'their own <u>Catholic priests</u> are the prophesized false christs who show great signs and wonders to deceive even the elect' (Matthew 24.24). And <u>likewise</u>, Catholics sit in Mass <u>every week</u> and have <u>no idea</u> that 'their own <u>Catholic Forefathers</u>' were the prophesized false prophets (or 'wolves in sheep's clothing') who have A) produced the bad fruit of absolute power, oppression, and desolation that is responsible for this 'present age of darkness' (Matthew 7.15-17), and **B)** built 'the Catholic house' on 'sand'. Thus, if Catholics (as well as other Christians, Jews, Muslims, etc.) could only realize what is written in the Bible concerning Jesus' true persona, His true mission, and 'what was actually being said 2000 years ago', then they would realize that the Catholic Church (i.e., its foundational, core doctrine) is built on sand, NOT rock, by (highly fallible, nonsensical, ignorant, foolish, defiled, unrighteous, and blindly Satan-like) false prophets (who were actually '<u>descendants</u> of <u>those who tortured and murdered Christ</u>')... meaning of course that <u>when</u> the flood comes (i.e., the return of Jesus) 'the Catholic house' will fall in a terrible crash (Matthew 7.26-27), being built on 'the ever changing, and shifting double tongue lies of Satan'.

Finally, to <u>reiterate</u> what has been said, by <u>creating</u> a <u>false image</u> of Jesus with the <u>Eucharist</u>, and subsequently (by speaking <u>lies</u> from behind the <u>Eucharist</u>) a <u>false persona</u> for their 'false Jesus', the

Catholic hierarchy has in fact created a new, defiled persona for the one true God. That 'false persona of God' is represented by the false god that goes by the name 'Catholicism'. And just like the Samaritans, Catholics profess 'the God who brought them out of the land of Egypt', yet they serve a false god named 'Catholicism' (2 Kings 17.33). Hence, 'the Catholic Church creating and serving their own idol and god has given rise to a world filled with different gods that we recognize, not by 'the names of false gods' as in the Old Testament, but by 'the names of religions'. I.e., the false gods of today's world go by the names of Catholicism, Protestantism, Christianity, Islam, Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, etc. Or each and every religion represents 'a different false persona of God', thus making each and every religion 'a different false god'. And of course Satan is well aware that, if we all serve a different persona of God, then it is the same as each of us serving a different god, and eventually we will fight and kill each other to protect the false god that we think is the one true God. So, because of the Eucharist and subsequent perversion of Jesus' identity - i.e., the lies spoken about Jesus' true intentions from behind the Eucharist - every entity on earth that is recognized as 'a <u>religion</u>' is actually 'a <u>false god</u>'; i.e., 'a <u>false persona</u> of the one true God'. And this <u>ultimately</u> means that, because of the **Eucharist** and subsequent **perversion** of **Jesus' identity**, the whole world is practicing **idolatry**... and <u>they don't even know it</u>. Thus, the **Eucharist** is the **greatest** and **most** deceptive false idol that mankind has ever witnessed, and is truly 'the source of division, war, and hate'.

4. The Catholic Church's Message of False Peace

If we can see the **possibility** for **error** and **false interpretation** when we **'whisper** a piece of information in a circle of people' - i.e., it is a totally different message by the time it gets back to 'the point of origin' - why can we (specifically the Catholic hierarchy) not see the potential for even greater error and false interpretation when it spans generations, cultures, and languages? Now for thousands of years, false prophets spoke *lies* and *error* in the name of God. God would then send His true Prophets to <u>correct</u> the people, but no one would listen; noting that this is referencing 'The Parable of the Evil Tenants of God's Vineyard'. Therefore, hoping the people would listen to His Son, God then sent Jesus to correct 'the error spoken in the name of God', but they <u>crucified Him</u>. So if nothing else, the <u>Bible</u> is <u>historical</u> evidence that God's own people continually fall into error while simultaneously 'stiffening their necks', rejecting the truth when it is offered to them. Knowing this, are we to believe the Catholic hierarchy when they <u>claim</u> that they are **infallible**, and thus it is <u>impossible</u> for them to *fall into* (macro) error? In other words, 'what is really impossible to believe' is that the Catholic hierarchy - who would most definitely assert that they are God's people or chosen ones - would venture to make the proud and arrogant claim that 'they are somehow exempt from the possibility of falling into error', even when the entire Bible is essentially 'a message about religious leaders blindly leading the multitudes astray in error'. Think about it. If we can see error taking shape right before our eyes in 'a circle of whispering people', then why can the Catholic hierarchy - regardless of how eloquently they honor Jesus and God with their words - not concede to the possibility of error when it spans generations, cultures, and languages? So we must know that, if Jesus' 'message of equality and <u>freedom'</u> - i.e., the true Good News of the New Covenant - was 'the truth at the beginning of the circle 2000 years ago', then you can be sure that His message, after spanning many generations, cultures, and languages, will be nothing like His original intention when it comes full circle and is 'whispered in His ear' once He returns. And this is why Jesus says in Matthew 24.14 that 'The true Good News will be told to all the nations at the end of this present age of darkness and the time of His 2nd coming'; of course implying that we have heard the Catholic's Church's false Good News for the last 2000 years, but we have never heard the true intentions of Jesus' original Good News. The false Good News (or Anti-Good News; see Section 12) of the Catholic Church - which is 'a hidden message of supremacy and enslavement' rooted in the worshiping of their false idol 'the <u>Eucharist</u>' - will <u>enrage Jesus</u> because it is a completely defiled version of the true Good News of the New Covenant that He originally taught and died for. The false Good News that the Catholic Church preaches - i.e., 'no salvation outside of Catholicism, and without the (false) mediation of the Catholic hierarchy' - is 'a message of supremacy and enslavement', disguised as 'Jesus' message of equality and freedom'; recognizing that 'supremacy and <u>enslavement</u> breeds and is <u>synonymous</u> with <u>division, war, and hate</u>', while '<u>equality</u> and <u>freedom</u> breeds and is synonymous with unity, peace, and love'. So realizing that A) peace cannot be attained without first having equality and freedom, and B) the Catholic Church's defiled <u>version</u> of the Good News is 'a message of **false** equality and **false** freedom' (i.e., 'a <u>hidden</u> message of supremacy and enslavement' that ultimately causes war), then we can say that 'the Catholic Church's

<u>message of false equality and false freedom</u>' = '<u>a message of false peace</u>'... which is corrupted (always having the **motive** of **controlling** people and <u>nations</u>) with the <u>error</u> of having been 'whispered' over <u>generations</u>, <u>cultures</u>, and <u>languages</u>.

And so in **blind error** the Catholic hierarchy preaches 'a message of **false peace**' by saying that 'We want <u>peace</u>', while <u>simultaneously harboring</u> 'the <u>source</u> of division, War, and hate'; i.e., the <u>Eucharist</u>. In blind error the Catholic hierarchy teaches a supremacy and enslavement (to them) which is rooted in the <u>Eucharist</u> - i.e., 'those who <u>worship</u> their <u>false idol</u> (which is ultimately the **Catholic hierarchy**) will <u>receive salvation first'</u> - then with a **double tongue**, '<u>calls for peace</u>', when '<u>peace</u> is <u>impossible</u> without first having equality and freedom'. And in blind error the Catholic hierarchy teaches division through supremacy - i.e., they say 'Our mob has a better way of worshiping God than your mob' - then with a double tongue, 'calls for <u>unity</u>'; which is actually just 'peacefully unified as their slaves'. Hence, as Jeremiah says, "They speak a vision of their own heart (for their own glory), not from the mouth of the Lord. They continually say 'The Lord said you shall have peace', (but they have not) stood in the counsel of the Lord" (Jeremiah 23.16-18). And as Paul points out in 2 Thessalonians 2.10-11, 'They did <u>not welcome</u> the truth (of the <u>New Covenant</u>)... so <u>God sends</u> the power of <u>error</u> to work in them so that they believe what is false'. So just as Jeremiah and Paul said these things to our ancestors, the same can be said to the Catholic hierarchy, as they arrogantly reject (for their own glory) the counsel of God's true Prophets and what is written in the Old Testament concerning idolatry. And they do not welcome the <u>true Good News</u> of the <u>New Covenant</u> (as it <u>removes their authority</u> as *false mediators*), or the <u>Primary</u> <u>Commandment</u>... so God has <u>allowed</u> them to be <u>led astray</u> into <u>error</u>. This means that, the <u>assertion</u> by the Catholic Church that 'they can never fall into error and corruption' - i.e., their arrogant claim of infallibility - is simply an outright lie which they have concocted in the interest of controlling God's people, and ultimately *controlling* all the nations. Remember here that **even Peter** unknowingly spoke the **error** of Satan in Matthew 16.22, so how much **more likely** is it that 'any supposed (by Catholicism) descendent of Peter in a 2000 year old whispering circle' would speak even greater error than Peter did... in the very presence of Jesus. It should also be noted that, the Catholic Church's claim of infallibility is a blatant contradiction of their own assertion of freewill. I.e., the Catholic Church cannot assert with a double tongue that 'they are incapable of falling into error and corruption' while also asserting in the <u>same breath</u> that 'they have <u>freewill</u>', as God will allow them to '<u>freely fall</u> into error and corruption' because that is 'the very definition' of freewill. Thus, since the Catholic hierarchy has proudly sworn oaths that they are <u>absolutely</u> and <u>rigidly infallible</u> and <u>incapable</u> of 'falling into (macro) <u>error</u>', they have consequently fallen (blindly and unknowingly) deep into <u>error</u> and <u>corruption</u>, blatantly breaking the Primary Commandment, and even the New Covenant that Jesus died for, thereby preaching 'a <u>hidden</u> message of supremacy (i.e., <u>false equality</u>) and enslavement (i.e., <u>false freedom</u>)', while <u>blindly</u> 'calling for **peace**', which is impossible without <u>true equality</u> and <u>true freedom</u>... meaning 'their call for peace' is 'a hidden call for false peace', as 'their peace' involves 'Our peacefully, unified subservience to them', with this hidden enslavement no doubt ending in revolution and <u>war</u>.

To further <u>confuse</u> matters, it is important to recognize that the Catholic hierarchy will <u>admit</u> that 'they as <u>individual men</u> can fall into <u>error</u> (or <u>fallibility</u>), and are <u>indeed corruptible</u>', yet they simultaneously assert that 'the <u>institution</u> of the Catholic Church as a <u>whole cannot</u> fall into <u>error</u> and is indeed <u>incorruptible</u>'. In other words, '<u>Catholicism's theory of an incorruptible church</u>' states that 'we can multiply a <u>corruptible individual man</u> to the <u>nth degree</u>, and it will somehow <u>equal</u> an <u>incorruptible</u> <u>whole church</u>'. Or in equation format:

(a *corruptible* individual man) x (10 X 666⁶⁶⁶) = (an incorruptible whole church)

First off, this theory is obviously void of all <u>logic</u> and <u>reason</u>; which by the way is 'the <u>same</u> <u>logic</u> and **reason** that **God gave us** so that we could put down the <u>lies</u> of Satan'. And so it is clear that 'Catholicism's theory of an incorruptible church' is from the mind of Satan, who speaks illogical nonsense and then attempts to peddle it as 'the wisdom of Christ'. To put their theory into perspective, it helps to draw a <u>simple parallel</u>: 'many individual corruptible men joining together' = 'an <u>incorruptible</u> whole church' is like saying 'many pieces of rotten fruit put together' = 'a basket of fresh fruit'... with 'corruptible men' of course being 'rotten fruit'. Now identifying that these previous conclusions lack all basic *logic* and *reason*, we are led to the <u>simple logical conclusion</u> that indeed 'many individual corruptible men joining together' = 'a basket of rotten fruit'. And so 'Catholicism's theory of an incorruptible church' lacks all basic logic and reason, and 'in simplest terms' is like saying 'We are corruptible (yes), but we are not corruptible (no). Their theory, 'in simplest terms', shows itself to be a 'double thought' - which is discussed later in this Section - that makes no sense. Consider another parallel. If you were told that '500+ evil, crooked Representatives and Senators can come together in Congress to make **good** laws', would you **believe** it? Absolutely **not**; that's a double minded contradiction. So **why** do we believe 'Catholicism's theory of an incorruptible church' as it is such an obvious contradiction in **basic** logic and reason? Thus 'Catholicism's theory of an incorruptible church' is simply a contradiction that is a product of Satan's twisted tongue and double mind. And in truth, 'their theory and their church' are both a product of the **Spirit of Error** (i.e., Satan), who has been leading Catholicism (disguised of course as the Holy Spirit) into error and corruption from 'day one'.

So it is important to realize that, from 'day one' the Apostles, like John, warned of the Spirit of Error (1 John 4.6), signifying that, even with the Apostles Still alive, lies and error about 'Jesus' true message and identity' were spreading like a disease. Paul reiterates this in 2 Corinthians 11.4; "For you gladly tolerate anyone who comes to you and preaches a different Jesus, not the One we preached; and you accept a spirit and a gospel completely different from the Spirit and the Gospel you received from us!" So by their writings it is evident that the Apostles witnessed the identity theft of Jesus from 'day one', and hence the spread of error from 'day one'. You see, even before the end of the first century, false prophets and false teachers (i.e., the Catholic Forefathers) were 'preaching a different, false identity or persona of Jesus' by 'placing words in His mouth that He never said' in order to gain the authority and supremacy that is associated with the name of Jesus; thereby essentially defiling Jesus'

message of equality, freedom, and peace (i.e., the New Covenant). They stole the name and identity of Jesus for control and power over people, which ultimately led to a mindset of 'supremacy and enslavement to man'; the precursors to war and the antithesis of equality, freedom, and peace. Now as there cannot be peace without first having 'equality and freedom', all of this ultimately means that the Eucharist - the source of Catholicism's error and corruption, and consequential supremacy and enslavement - must be exposed and destroyed in order to have true world peace, as the Eucharist is the false idol from behind which the Catholic Forefathers crafted their 'false persona of Jesus'. So we must know that, with the creation of the Eucharist, the Catholic Forefathers (i.e., the false prophets and false teachers of the 1st - 5th centuries) fell into error and corruption, defiling 'Jesus' true Good News' into 'a message of supremacy and enslavement'; which thereby also defiled His message of true peace into 'a message of false peace'. Hence from 'day one' the first whispers of Jesus' true Good News have been (under the influence of the Spirit of Error) corrupted in error by the false prophets and false teachers of (what would become) Catholicism, speaking lies from behind the name of Jesus and an idol deceptively named 'Jesus'.

Now Jesus' 1st coming is when He died to 'sow the seeds of peace' (John 12.24). But what we must understand is that 'Jesus' words were only the seeds' (Luke 8.11). We have read stories of 4500-year-old seeds found in the pyramids that sprouted to life. Without light, in addition to good soil and water, the seeds **stayed dormant** all that time. So just as these seeds **stayed dormant** in the **darkness**, SO tOO have Jesus' words lain dormant. For 2000 years it has been an 'age of darkness' due to the Catholic Church's message of false peace; or it has been 'night' for 2000 years (John 9.4). When Jesus, 'the Light', returns to this world, His revelation of hidden knowledge (i.e., the apocalypse) will shine on the seeds that He sowed 2000 years ago, thereby bringing them to life; noting that this corresponds to 'the <u>true</u> Good News being told to all the nations at <u>the **end**</u> of this <u>present</u> <u>age of darkness'</u> (Matthew 24.14). And so Jesus' 2nd coming, the return of the Light at the end of this present age of darkness, is when His seeds will finally bear 'the fruit of peace'. Thus Jesus did not promise immediate peace because He knew that it would take many generations for His 'seeds of peace' to be understood. Jesus says in Luke 12.49&51, "I came to set the earth on fire, and how I wish it were already kindled! Do you <u>suppose</u> that I came to <u>bring **peace**</u> to the world? **No, not peace**, but division". Jesus' truth initially causes *division* away from all of Satan's lies, but it *eventually* leads to *unity*. Jesus stood against an entire man-made institution, therefore from a human perspective He caused division, but only to eventually gain unity and peace upon His return. From the account in Matthew 24.4-12, Jesus knew that the Catholic Forefathers would 'come in the name of Christ, deceiving many, and causing wars and widespread <u>lawlessness</u>'. Hence Jesus knew that the Catholic Church (acting as Satan's puppet or 'the Beast') would <u>deceive</u> and <u>divide</u> the entire world using His name (scattering in the <u>name</u> of God) <u>until</u> 'His return' and 'the 1000 years of peace' spoken about in Revelation 20.3: "The angel threw Satan into the abyss, locked it, and sealed it, so that he could not deceive the nations anymore until the 1000 years were over". As Jesus says in Matthew 26.31, 'The Shepherd will be struck and the flock will be scattered'. So for nearly 2000 years the Catholic Church has been 'secretly scattering God's flock (i.e., humanity) using the name of Christ', while simultaneously pretending to 'qather in the name of Christ'

(Matthew 12.30). And for nearly 2000 years the Catholic hierarchy has been acting as 'righteous servants who seek peace', while actually being 'unrighteous servants' (or 'evil tenants') responsible for war and desolation among God's people'. Thus, for nearly 2000 years the Catholic hierarchy has been preaching and propagating 'a message of false peace' that is disguised as 'a message of true peace'... and this will become obvious when the Light returns, making the seeds of true peace come to life.

In Matthew 21.33-46 (and Luke 20.9-19) Jesus tells 'The Parable of the Evil Tenants of God's Vineyard'. This parable actually names the Catholic hierarchy as the evil tenants of God's vineyard who are responsible for the desolation of God's people after killing Jesus and casting Him out of God's vineyard. This parable, coupled with Jesus' description of the 2000 year time period after His death (Matthew 24.1-31), describe an 'age of darkness' under the deceptive influence of 'the false christs and false prophets' of Catholicism (verses 5, 11, and 24); which they, being ministers of false peace, will of course insist has been an 'age of light' with them in control. But the true 'age of light' will not begin until 'the Dawn'; which is the 2nd coming of Jesus. In this parable the Landowner of the vineyard is God, the grapevines of the vineyard represent God's people, the fruit is basically 'anything and everything produced by God's people' (whether intellectual property, such as knowledge, or physical goods and services), the servants are God's true Prophets, the Landowner's Son is Jesus, and the evil tenants are the religious leaders (i.e., forefathers) of the Catholic Church and their 'pre-Christ' predecessors. 'The Parable of the Evil Tenants of God's Vineyard' is summarized as follows.

The Landowner leased His vineyard to the evil tenants and then journeyed far away. At harvest time the Landowner (God) sent His servants (the Prophets) to collect (or gather) fruit (what God's people produced) from the evil tenants (the religious leaders). But the greedy, lustful tenants wanted <u>all</u> of the fruit for themselves (i.e., they wanted to keep the labor, goods, knowledge, etc. of the people, staying 'drunk on the fruit of the vine'). So they beat, stoned, and killed the servants. Hence the Landowner sent His Son (Jesus) to collect (or gather) fruit from the evil tenants, thinking 'Surly they will respect My Son'. Instead, the evil tenants - believing that the Son was the true Heir to the vineyard - killed (or crucified) the Son and Cast Him out of the vineyard so that they could gain ownership of the vineyard (God's people and everything that they produce). Jesus concludes by saying 'When the Landowner returns to the vineyard, He will kill the evil tenants for killing His Son and His servants, and for attempting to keep all of the fruit for themselves'. Note that 'When the Landowner returns' refers to 'Jesus' 2nd coming' meaning that the evil tenants still reign over God's vineyard. And at the time of His 2nd coming, 'the **Chief Cornerstone** (referring to Jesus) will fall on the religious leaders and grind them to powder', thereby returning the vineyard to righteous tenants who will produce fruit (knowledge, businesses, governments, etc.) worthy of the kingdom of God. It is also important to note that Jesus' 2nd coming represents *His return to the vineyard* after being cast out by the evil tenants nearly 2000 years ago.

Thus, despite the Catholic Church's <u>rewritten</u>, <u>skewed historical accounts</u> of their 'supposed' glorious reign over God's vineyard <u>after</u> Jesus' death, Jesus is clearly describing something quite the <u>contrary</u>. He

portrays an 'age of darkness' - not light - after He is killed by the evil tenants. Jesus portrays an age when many evil tenants or 'false prophets will come in His name and deceive the multitudes' (Matthew 24.5). But how do we know that the evil tenants in this parable are the modern day religious leaders of Catholicism/Christianity and their Catholic Forefathers? Notice that the evil tenants truly thought that Jesus was the Son of God and that by killing Him (the true Heir to the vineyard) they would gain control and power over God's people. The Jewish religion - or any other religion besides Christianity - 'then and today' does not believe that 'Jesus was the true Savior and Son of God', thus Jesus was prophesying about the very people who professed (and still profess) Him as being the Savior and Son of God. These people stole Jesus' name and identity to gain His inheritance - i.e., control of God's vineyard or His people; which is also referred to as 'the bride of Christ' - and were 'descendants so to speak' of the people who <u>crucified Jesus</u>. The <u>only possible group</u> of people 'professing the name of Jesus as Savior and Son of God' and 'claiming to be the true tenants of God's vineyard' is the Catholic hierarchy and their forefathers. And through the centuries the Catholic evil tenants - in the interest of 'being supreme like God' - have degenerated God's vine (i.e., His people) by teaching people to follow the false god 'Catholicism' and their false idol 'the Eucharist'; which of course has produced degenerate fruit (i.e., false knowledge, corrupt businesses and governments, etc.), no doubt leading to untold 'division, war, and hate'. So because of the Catholic Forefathers' (and their descendants') lust and envy for Jesus' bride and Jesus' power and authority, they consequently fell to Satan's temptation, speaking lies in the name of Christ for their OWN glory, thereby being easily tricked into becoming his next (the first being 'pre-*Christ'*) evil tenants of God's vineyard.

So, how long will the Catholic 'ministers of false peace' rule as the evil tenants? Or what is the time interval between 'when the Son is killed' and 'when the Chief Cornerstone will return to kill the evil tenants and turn the vineyard over to righteous tenants'? It is obviously a period of time longer than most people might expect, as the Catholic hierarchy has already ruled the vineyard for almost 2000 years. But, although we may not expect this period to be of considerable length, Jesus does actually state that the darkness will last for a long time. Before Jesus died He told us that the world will experience 'an age of darkness' after He (the Light) was gone. This time interval or 'age of darkness' is 'what' Jesus is referring to when He says "The night is coming when no one can work. While I (Jesus) am in the world, I am the Light for the world" (John 9.4-5). Jesus also says in John 12.35 "The **Light** will be among you **a little longer**. Continue on your way while you have the light, so **the darkness** will not come upon you; for the one who walks in the dark does not know where he is going". The Apostles asked Jesus in Matthew 24.3-14, 'When will the **end** of the age of darkness and Your 2nd coming occur' and 'When will the coinciding destruction of the temple occur'? Jesus responds by saying to the Apostles, 'Many will come in My name and deceive many (i.e., the Catholic false prophets and false teachers will come in the name of Christ and deceive the multitudes). Nation will rise against nation. Wars, earthquakes, and famines will occur. Lawlessness will abound. And this is all just the **beginning** of sorrows'. Thus Jesus is directly stating that the time interval of 'night or darkness' in which the Catholic Church will rule the vineyard (before the Light returns) is a considerable length of time (see Section 5.3). That is, the darkness of the Catholic Church will rule the vineyard until 'the

<u>Dawn'</u>, when the <u>Morning Star rises</u> (2 Peter 1.19 and Revelation 22.16), with '<u>the Dawn'</u> representing the <u>2nd coming</u> of Christ, <u>the Light of the world</u>; noting that 'the Dawn' also represents 'the destruction of <u>all</u> of our man-made <u>temples</u>' and 'our <u>exodus</u> from an <u>age of darkness</u> into an <u>age of light</u>'. It should also be noted here that 'the destruction of the temple' <u>does not</u> refer to <u>one</u> isolated <u>temple</u> - as in <u>70 AD</u> when the Romans destroyed the temple in Jerusalem - but to the destruction of <u>all</u> temples at the time of Jesus' return and the <u>end</u> of this present <u>age of darkness</u>.

It is also important that you not be fooled when the Catholic Church refers to itself as 'the bride of Christ' because we know from Revelation 19.7-16 that Christ will not be married to His bride (which is all of humanity) until His 2nd coming; or until 'the Dawn'. Ironically, this (figurative) marriage will not occur until the fall of the Catholic Church ('the fall of Babylon and the Beasts' in Revelation chapters 18 and 19), when 'the evil tenants and their temples are ground to powder by the Chief Cornerstone', at which time there will be 1000 years of peace (Revelation 20.3). And so the truth is that the Catholic Church is not 'the bride of Christ' but rather 'the Beast of Revelation', and the Catholic leaders are most definitely 'the evil tenants who pose as false christs', holding the bride of Christ captive until the Dawn. Thus the Catholic evil tenants have allowed Satan's degenerative vines to overrun God's vineyard for nearly 2000 years, thereby corrupting and defiling the bride of Christ, while simultaneously pretending to be 'the righteous tenants who <u>supposedly **destroy**</u> Satan's degenerative vines and <u>defend</u> the bride of Christ'. For nearly 2000 years the false prophets of the Catholic hierarchy have acted as false christs, imprisoning and enslaving the bride of Christ, while pretending to facilitate its 'equality, freedom, and peace'. For nearly 2000 years the false prophets and false christs of Catholicism, in the interest of their own <u>supremacy</u> and <u>lustfulness</u> for the <u>bride</u> of <u>Christ</u>, have propagated their own message of *false* equality, false freedom, and false peace. They say 'peace, peace' (Jeremiah 8.11), when their definition of peace involves *subservience to them* as if they are Christ. Therefore, if the Catholic hierarchy's definition of peace involves 'their supremacy over us' and 'our enslavement to them' - remembering of course that there cannot be true peace without first having equality and freedom - then their definition of peace is actually 'a message of false peace' proclaimed by false prophets (see Jeremiah 28.2-4 where **Hananiah** also proclaimed 'a message of false peace').

Using similar metaphors (such as people being *trees*, <u>instead</u> of *vines*, that produce *fruit*) to *'The Parable of the Evil Tenants of God's Vineyard'*, Jesus explains in Matthew 7.15-23 how *'False prophets* proclaiming *false peace* will appear as *lambs* on the <u>outside</u>, but are really wolves on the <u>inside'</u>, and that <u>ultimately</u> *'We will know false prophets by their fruits'*; comparing *'false prophets'* to *'bad trees who produce poisonous fruit'*. So *'the fruit of false knowledge'* produced by false prophets <u>sounds like</u> (just as the wolf dresses like a lamb) *'a message of freedom and peace'*, but once people are *enslaved* and *at war by* their message, it becomes <u>obvious</u> that it was actually *'a message of false freedom and false peace'*; or their message was *'bad, poisonous fruit'*. Therefore, we must recognize that *'the doctrine of lies spoken from behind the Eucharist'* is *'poisonous fruit* of false knowledge' which has been created by false prophets of the early Catholic Church. And this *'poisonous fruit* of supremacy and *exclusion'* that has been *'consumed'* into the minds of countless multitudes is what is responsible for many generations of people *'senselessly warring and living in desolation'*. And so Jesus says in Matthew

7.15-23, "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravenous wolves. You will know them by their fruits (of false knowledge). Not everyone who calls Me 'Lord, Lord' will enter the kingdom of heaven. Many (false prophets) will say to Me 'Lord, Lord, in Your name we prophesied and spoke God's message, in Your name we drove out many demons and performed many miracles!' Then I (Jesus) will say to them, 'I never knew you; get away from Me you wicked people who practice lawlessness!" In these verses Jesus is trying to make us realize that false prophets, such as the Catholic hierarchy, will <u>proclaim Jesus' name over and over again</u>, **insisting** that they are following His teaching (thereby appearing as harmless sheep), but they are really teaching a distortion of His words only to glorify themselves and enslave us (thereby actually being wolves). And so false prophets teach 'their own message of supremacy, enslavement, and violence' that is disguised as (like a wolf disguises himself as a lamb) 'Jesus' message of equality, freedom, and peace'. That is, they <u>disguise</u> (just as in the Garden of Eden) their 'fruit of **false** knowledge' as 'fruit of **true** knowledge'. Jesus even says that false prophets who speak His name are allowed to perform miracles and drive out demons; something the Catholic hierarchy holds up as proof that they are 'on the same side as Christ'. But Jesus has told us in advance that false prophets such as the Catholic hierarchy, as much as they claim to speak God's message and perform miracles, are really wicked, lawless followers of Satan who out of a **lust** to be <u>supreme like God</u> - are actually **opposed** to the **true Good News** of the New Covenant: a message of peace through equality and freedom. I.e., as much as the Catholic hierarchy claims to 'know Jesus', they do not abide by the Primary Commandment and the New Covenant, and so 'they are liars' (1 John 2.4) and 'Jesus has never known them'. Remember, spotting Satan's lies and fruit of false knowledge can sometimes be nearly impossible when he has disguised himself and his ministers as 'good trees bearing good fruit of true knowledge', and as harmless sheep. Therefore, Satan's 'ministers of lawlessness' and 'prophets of false peace' - the Catholic hierarchy - may appear as sheep on the surface, but they are really ravenous wolves at 'the core of their teaching'. They say, 'peace, peace', while simultaneously harboring the source of war; the Eucharist. They say, 'peace, peace', while simultaneously preaching with a **double tongue** their own 'message of supremacy and enslavement to man', thereby hindering peace, not helping peace. And so the Catholic hierarchy preaches 'a message of false peace' that they blindly believe is 'a message true peace'; offering us their poisonous fruit that they believe is *pleasant fruit*. Over and over again they say "'Peace, peace!' When there is no peace" (Jeremiah 8.11). Thus, when Jesus returns "The ambassadors of peace shall weep bitterly" (Isaiah 33.7) and feel great shame over having **both** eaten and produced Satan's poisonous fruit of false knowledge; which they then **blindly** offered to the multitudes, just as Eve offered it to Adam.

By the previous Old Testament quotes it is obvious that people (i.e., false prophets) who spoke words of *freedom* and *peace* did so in the name of their <u>own glory</u> and <u>supremacy</u>. Hence their message was of <u>false equality</u>, <u>false freedom</u>, and consequently <u>false peace</u>; i.e., it was really 'a <u>hidden</u> message of <u>supremacy</u>, <u>enslavement</u>, <u>and violence</u>'. And so for thousands of years false prophets have spoken in <u>contradictions</u> with a <u>forked</u> or <u>double tongue</u> for their own glory and supremacy, and consequently the <u>unknowing</u> glory and supremacy of <u>Satan</u>; from whom they <u>received</u> their *forked* tongue. To recognize a false prophet who speaks in *contradictions*, you must understand <u>the deceptive</u>

brilliance of a forked tongue or double tongue. In Matthew 5.37 Jesus says "Let your 'Yes' be 'Yes' and your 'No' be 'No' - for whatever is more than these comes from the Evil One". The Catholic Church is a master at combining a 'Yes' and a 'No' in one thought to confuse the truth, thereby speaking with a double tongue; as James 4.8 says 'they are <u>double minded</u>'. If you combine a 'Yes' and a 'No' in one thought - noting that 'in one thought' is the **key** to identifying a 'double thought' - then you are stating two opposing thoughts as if they are not opposing or contradicting one another. If you combine a 'Yes' and a 'No' in **one** thought - a double thought - then you are speaking **double mindedly** like the Evil One. As an example, a Catholic priest will tell you 'I am not Christ' (no), but at the same time 'You have to go through me to be forgiven by Christ' (yes). Speaking with a double tongue, his 'No' is a 'Yes', and his 'Yes' is a 'No', thereby stating 'two opposing thoughts in one thought' as if they are not opposing thoughts. Speaking with a double tongue, he is 'saying without saying' that 'I exalt myself to the same level as Christ'; just as Satan does. Can we not reason that, if they (Catholic priests) truly do not claim to be Christ, then why would we **need** them in order to interact with Christ? By saying 'You <u>need us</u> to interact with <u>Christ</u>' (being <u>mediators</u> to the **SOIE** <u>Mediator</u>) the Catholic hierarchy has in fact <u>broken</u> the New Covenant - our direct relationship with God - and its equality clause, placing themselves in a supreme position to us a false mediators in 'the chain of salvation'; remembering of course that this supremacy is the breeding ground of 'division, war, and hate'. This is the cleverness and deceptive brilliance of Satan's double tongue, and why Jesus tells the Pharisees and Teachers of the Law - who either knowingly or unknowingly spoke the double tongue lies of their traditions - 'You have a clever way of rejecting God's law in order to uphold your own (man-made) teaching and traditions, honoring God with your lips while your hearts are far away' (Mark 7.6-9). I.e., with your mouth you swear allegiance (or an oath) to God, but with your heart you swear allegiance (or an oath) to man... which is ultimately swearing an oath to Satan.

To further explain, by 'swearing an <u>oath</u> to God (or in God's name) that **this** or **that** (Catholic) doctrine is rigidly and absolutely infallible, true knowledge', the Catholic Forefathers put themselves in a position where anytime *their doctrine* was <u>shown</u> to be *false doctrine*, they would place <u>fig leaves</u> (usually in the form of a contradiction or double thought) over their ignorance; of course to retain the control, power, glory, and money (i.e., the things of Satan) that came with swearing allegiance to the false god, Catholicism. And by doing this, their *false* knowledge was then **propagated** through the generations as being true knowledge, thereby making unknowing, blind descendants of the Catholic Forefathers blindly swear oaths to the false god, Catholicism, which is ultimately Satan, as 'swearing oaths of allegiance (for at least the <u>hierarchy</u>) to Catholicism' = 'the <u>enslavement</u> of men to themselves'; noting here that by this, we can see how 'traditional doctrine spoken in the name of God' cleverly exalts 'man and his laws', while pretending to exalt 'God and His laws'. And so we can see how repeating the double thoughts of Satan [like 'Christ is the sole Mediator (yes), but you can't get to the sole Mediator (no) without us other (non-sole) mediators'] eventually ends in swearing allegiance (or an oath) to Satan, while believing that you are swearing allegiance (or an oath) to God (Matthew 5.34), and is why Jesus says 'Do not swear oaths to God' (Matthew 5.34). I.e., a Catholic priest's 'oath (or vow) of ordination' is an oath that represents 'the supremacy of man' (and consequently <u>Satan</u>), but is sworn in the name of God. So their

'oath of ordination sworn in the <u>name of God</u>' is really 'an <u>oath of superiority</u> sworn in the <u>name of Satan</u>', and they don't even know it! As Zephaniah 1.4-6 says 'The idolatrous priests <u>think</u> that they <u>swear oaths to</u> (and consequently worship) <u>the Lord</u>, yet in actuality they have turned their backs on the Lord by <u>also swearing oaths to Molech</u> (a false god, and ultimately Satan disguised as God)'. So as the Catholic hierarchy and their forefathers have surely '<u>sworn</u> by God and by heaven that their <u>false knowledge</u> is <u>absolutely</u> and <u>infallibly true knowledge</u>', and then <u>covered over</u> their false knowledge with <u>double tongue</u> <u>contradictions</u> (i.e., <u>fig leaves</u>) for their continued control over men, they have also thereby <u>blindly</u> sworn 'oath's that <u>alorify themselves</u> (and consequently Satan)' which are <u>disguised as</u> 'oaths that <u>glorify God</u>', <u>cleverly</u> exalting '<u>man</u> and his laws' while pretending to exalt 'God and His laws'.

The Catholic hierarchy - with almost 2000 years of experience in 'swearing oaths that glorify man while pretending to glorify God' - has taken their ability to speak with a double tongue to an almost sadistic art form. In a perpetual state of contradiction they say things like 'You are forgiven by Jesus (yes), but not without the absolution of a Catholic priest (no)'. And 'The Holy Spirit transforms the bread into Jesus (yes), but without a certified, ordained priest, the bread cannot be transformed into Jesus (no)'. Likewise, 'salvation is through the Man, Christ Jesus (yes), but you will not receive salvation without the <u>men</u> of the Catholic hierarchy (<u>no</u>)'. Or in other words, '<u>We do not glorify</u> ourselves (no), but rather Christ'. But by making people glorify the Catholic Church (i.e., 'no salvation outside the Catholic Church'), they are really saying 'We glorify ourselves (yes)'; as they are the leaders of the Catholic Church. The Catholic hierarchy will also say 'We are the bride of Christ (yes)', but by making people bow to them in the confessional as if they are Christ, they are no longer acting as the bride of Christ (no), but rather Christ Himself. By 'saying one thing and doing another' (Matthew 23.3), the Catholic hierarchy is pretending to be humble while acting supreme. And so in actuality they act as 'either or both' 'bride and Christ Himself' whenever it is convenient to do so in order to maintain their unrighteous authority. Additionally, the Catholic hierarchy will say 'Partaking in the Eucharist will cleanse your soul if you are already clean (yes), but partaking in the Eucharist will not cleanse your soul if your soul is stained (no)'. We must ask the question 'Why would someone bother partaking in the Eucharist to become clean, if they are already clean?' The Catholic hierarchy's convoluted double thoughts - their oaths that pretend to honor God, while actually honoring their false god, Catholicism, and ultimately themselves - are complete nonsense. They speak their convoluted nonsense, and if you can't make <u>logical sense</u> out of their <u>nonsense</u>, then they will say that 'It's only because you don't have <u>enough faith or knowledge</u> to comprehend'; they will say 'Ye of little faith'. They will also tell you that you are simply 'unlearned' because their warped logic (or supposed wisdom) does not make sense to your common sense. But in truth, they are simply bullying people with doubletalk, and it is they who are lacking the most basic knowledge. The fact is that your mind will not allow you to comprehend a 'Yes' and a 'No' (a double thought) at one time because it goes against your common sense; it is quite simply a contradiction. Thus, 'in the end', the false wisdom and warped logic of all of the Catholic hierarchy's contradictions 'will be brought to nothing'. In the end 'God will destroy the false wisdom of the supposedly wise Catholic hierarchy' (1 Corinthians 1.19).

Words are utterly deceiving. Do not be deceived by the supposed wisdom of men with an extensive vocabulary, such as the leaders of Catholicism; as well as most any other religious leader. A child can also be taught to speak with an extensive vocabulary, yet that does not mean that he can speak with true wisdom. Just like a child who has become proficient at 'hearing and repeating' like a parrot, the Catholic hierarchy (i.e., <u>Satan's parrots</u>) is also quite <u>proficient</u> at 'hearing and repeating', yet they repeat nonsense contradictions that they have received from their forefathers; 'not from the mouth of the Lord' (Jeremiah 23.16) . I.e., they know the language, not the logic. And just like their forefathers, the Catholic hierarchy has become skilled in 'the art of word manipulation' in order to disguise their double minded contradictions that have ensured their supremacy for nearly 2000 years. The Catholic hierarchy's words are convoluted nonsense, not wisdom. And when they are tested on the basic rationale and reasoning behind their long-winded nonsense, they repeat 'tradition' as if tradition is a *justification* for breaking the laws of God. That's like your grandfather 'killing someone in the past', then you also 'kill someone in the present' and claim 'family tradition' as a defense for <u>murder</u>. Again the Catholic hierarchy's words are convoluted, double minded nonsense, not wisdom. We must ask ourselves 'Why are their words so long-winded and convoluted when **Jesus**, the One they say they are following and imitating, spoke with such simple words?' Again, it is to disguise their double tongue lies that maintain their control and power. Words are utterly deceiving; do not be deceived by words of nonsense contradictions from an extensive vocabulary. Remember that Satan speaks with an extensive vocabulary so that he can twist and distort the nuances of the word of God to form a contradiction that he claims is not a contradiction. 'Satan - the devil - is in the details'. Hence we must know the details of the truth in order to identify Satan's double tongue lies and contradictions that he plants <u>side-by-side</u> with the truth; just as he 'plants the tares side-by-side with the wheat'.

The Pope has identified himself as the 'Vicar of Christ'. Vicar is defined as 'a substitute, or anyone acting in the person of a superior'. In false humility, the Pope uses his title of Vicar as if he is subservient to a superior, yet it is 'he who is acting as the superior' by vainly speaking as if his words are the words that Jesus (and consequently God) would speak. With his well trained double tongue the Pope says 'I am not Christ (no), but I act as Christ (yes), speaking for Him in His absence'. With his well trained double tongue, the Pope says 'My words are not Christ's words (no), but if I speak words in an infallible context as Vicar of Christ, those words are as though Christ spoke them Himself (yes)'. Thus the Pope's 'No' is a 'Yes', and his 'Yes' is a 'No', clearly indicating - according to Jesus in Matthew 5.37 - that the Pope speaks on behalf of the Evil One. And so if the Pope speaks with a double tongue on behalf of the Evil One, he is - according to Jesus Himself - the 'Vicar of Satan', not the 'Vicar of Christ'. I.e., he is 'acting in the person of his superior', Satan.

While the Catholic Church does uphold the idea that the Pope is *infallible* as of the <u>supposed</u> Vicar of Christ, it is important to realize that, *in most matters of infallibility*, the Catholic Church conveniently removes attention from <u>one man</u> (the Pope) and <u>redirects</u> that attention to an 'ecumenical council' run by a <u>group</u> of supposed learned and wise men. 'One man speaking in an infallible context <u>as if</u> speaking for Jesus' can easily be questioned and held accountable, <u>but a supposedly 'divinely inspired ecumenical</u> council' cannot easily be held accountable; i.e., blame cannot be placed on any **one** man. An ecumenical

council is a **mysterious body** of so-called *'learned and wise men'*, all in agreement, creating man-made laws that are <u>disguised as</u> God's laws. This is what Paul is referring to as *'the mysterious lawlessness'* (2 Thessalonians 2.7), or *'a lawlessness that is <u>hard to understand</u> or <u>comprehend'</u> because of the deceptive brilliance of <u>many double tongues</u> <i>all speaking lies in <u>unison</u>*. Satan's mysterious lawlessness is <u>pure evil</u> because it appears, on the surface, as righteousness and good. <u>The Pope is no doubt the leader of the Catholic Church's mysterious lawlessness</u> - or he is *'the lawless one'* - but with the addition of ecumenical councils, the deceptive mysterious lawlessness of the Catholic Church becomes exceedingly hard to refute. Thus the leaders of the Catholic Church have excelled in *'the art of bully tactics'*, knowing that <u>the authority of *'a mysterious council of men'* becomes unquestionable (i.e., infallible) when under the disguise of being led by the Holy Spirit. But the truth is that *'the only spirit'* that has led *'any of the ecumenical councils'* - in addition to the office of the Papacy itself - is **'the Spirit of Error'**.</u>

Paul prophesies about 'the lawless one and the mysterious lawlessness of the Catholic Church' in 2 Thessalonians 2.3-12. "Do not let anyone deceive you in any way. For 'the Day' (of the 2nd coming of Christ) will not come unless the falling away (i.e., the Catholic Church's falling away from God by <u>rejecting</u> His New Covenant) comes first and the <u>lawless one</u> is revealed. (The lawless one) will oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God or all that is worshipped. He will even go in and sit down in God's temple and show himself to be God. (And this) mysterious lawlessness is already at work (2000 years ago!). The lawless one (is here) according to the working of Satan. (He performs) signs and lying wonders with unrighteous deception among those who (will) perish. And God sends those who will perish strong delusion (the power of error), that they should believe the lie." Contrary to what the Catholic hierarchy claims, God will allow the Spirit of Error (Satan) to test their church (Deuteronomy 13.3) so 'that they should believe the lie'. 'The lie' - which of course has been spoken from behind a false Jesus, the Eucharist - is 'that Jesus came to establish a new religion, Catholicism'. Hence, just as Jesus was tested by Satan in the desert with the words of God, so too has the Catholic hierarchy been tested; although they have <u>failed</u> miserably, proving that 'they love control and supremacy over men more than God' (Deuteronomy 13.3). By 'changing the intentions of Scripture' and 'telling lies that are so close to the truth that they appear to be the truth', Satan has tricked the Pope and all his predecessors into speaking <u>lies</u> from behind a false image of Jesus (the Eucharist) in order to "oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God or all that is worshipped". Satan has tricked the Pope into speaking lies from behind the Eucharist so that he should "go in and sit down in God's temple and show himself to <u>be God</u>"; of course exalting himself <u>above</u> Christ, while saying with false humility and a <u>double tongue</u> that he <u>serves</u> Christ as the 'Vicar of Christ'. Thus Satan has tricked the Pope into being 'the lawless one': 'the one' who 'acts in the person of Satan' (i.e., Vicar of Satan), unknowingly being responsible for creating and propagating 'man-made laws that are cloaked as God's laws'.

Again, it is the <u>double minded</u> thoughts that Satan has instilled <u>deep into the *doctrine*</u> and <u>traditions</u> of the Catholic Church that keeps the Pope and his hierarchy blind to the fact that 'their man-made laws' are actually 'the laws of mysterious lawlessness'. Their laws exalt themselves to the status of 'God to other men' - i.e., they 'show themselves to be <u>supreme</u> like God to others in the house which is called by

God's name' - thereby enslaving God's people to themselves, while being tricked by Satan's double mind into actually believing that their laws are written in the interest of serving God and His people. There is no other man on this earth who claims to be the Vicar of Christ, arrogantly speaking words (i.e., laws and doctrine) for Jesus and God, thereby 'showing himself to be God' without - by virtue of a double tongue - actually 'showing himself to be God'. Therefore there is no other man on this earth besides the Catholic Pope who can claim the title of 'the lawless one', 'performing signs and lying wonders to deceive'. And there is no other institution on this earth besides Catholicism that influences law - and has for nearly 2000 years - for Satan; disguising 'Satan's mysterious lawlessness' as 'God's laws of righteousness'. And so regardless of Paul's warning - "Do not let anyone deceive you in any way" - the lawless one and the false prophets of his man-made institution have 'stolen the names of God and Jesus' and 'spoken double minded lies in Their names' in the interest of their own glory and supremacy. Hence countless generations and multitudes of people have been deceived and led astray in error to unknowingly 'do the will of Satan' while thinking that they are 'doing the will of God'. Remember that 'the **best deceptions** are the ones where those deceived do not even realize that they have been deceived'. Countless generations and multitudes of people have been unknowingly deceived and led astray by the lawless one and his predecessors, believing that 'the lie' fabricated by the Spirit of Error is actually the truth from the Spirit of God. By leading countless generations and multitudes of people astray with their double minded doctrine of Satan, 'the lawless one and his institution of false prophets' has propagated lawlessness (or 'a hidden message of supremacy and enslavement') that is disguised as God's laws of righteousness; thus essentially propagating 'a message of false peace' that is disguised as 'a message of true peace'.

warns us in his epistles to 'Not believe all who claim to have the Spirit, but test them to find out if the spirit they have comes from Jesus' Spirit of Truth or Satan's Spirit of Error. For many false prophets have gone out everywhere' (1 John 4.1&6). John 'keyed in on' false prophets or antichrists who speak the words of Christ (the Spirit of Truth) claiming 'to know Him', yet in actuality distort Christ's words to deceive others for their own glory and supremacy. Thus antichrists, while using the words of Christ, actually speak the *intentions* of the Spirit of Error, who himself is disguised with the words and name of Christ (the Spirit of Truth). And so an antichrist says 'I know Jesus', yet does not keep His Commandments (1 John 2.4). Today's religious leaders, just like the false prophets of John's day, claim to know Jesus, yet break God's **Primary** Commandment by 'speaking lies in His name', thus making them antichrists. As John points out, the antichrists of his day were people that the Apostles actually knew. "They went out from (the Apostles), but they were not of (the Apostles)" (1 John 2.18-19). The antichrists were people who used the same words and terminology as the Apostles, saying they too 'knew Jesus', yet twisted the true knowledge and Commandments of Christ for their own control, power, glory, and supremacy. The antichrists were basically false apostles that looked and sounded identical to the real Apostles 'in word', but not in their intentions. The antichrists said 'they knew Christ' just as the real Apostles knew Christ, yet they attached 'their own commandments' to 'the Commandments of Christ' thereby making His Commandments <u>null</u> and <u>void</u>. The antichrists were led by the **Spirit of Error** (i.e., Satan or 'the Antichrist') into secretly undermining the teaching of Christ by

John, knowing the double minded lawless nature of false prophets such as the Catholic Forefathers,

attaching to 'it' (Christ's teaching) the doctrine of Satan and his <u>false interpretations</u> of Jesus' true words. As John says, "Anyone who does not stay with the teaching of Christ, but goes beyond it, does not have God" (2 John 1.9). Thus <u>anyone who takes the teaching of Christ</u> and <u>attaches</u> to it their own doctrine is an <u>antichrist</u>... saying '<u>I know Him'</u>' yet not keeping His Commandments. Paul reiterates the fact that antichrists were teaching 'commandments in the name of Jesus' that were <u>not</u> His Commandments. Galatians 1.8 says, "But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach to you 'a gospel' that is <u>different</u> from the one we preached to you, may he be condemned to hell!" 'A <u>different</u> gospel of Christ' looks and sounds like 'the <u>real</u> gospel of Christ', and it is preached by antichrists claiming to <u>know</u> Jesus and the Apostles. Yet an antichrist's gospel is a defilement of the true words and teaching of Christ. An antichrist's gospel is 'a man-made gospel of <u>supremacy and enslavement'</u> disguised as 'Christ's gospel of <u>equality and freedom'</u>. And so an antichrist's gospel - such as that preached by the Catholic Church - is 'a message of <u>false</u> peace' disguised as 'a message of <u>true</u> peace'.

It is interesting to note that most Protestant evangelists are 'on the lookout' for 'the Antichrist' as someone who will 'openly oppose' Christ. We already know from John that 'the antichrists looked and sounded like the real Apostles'. The antichrists did not openly oppose Christ, but rather exalted Christ with their words, having the hidden agenda of exalting themselves. Hence they used the word of Christ to oppose Christ. The brilliance of an antichrist's double tongue and changed intentions exalts himself by pretending to honor and exalt Christ and/or God with words (Matthew 15.8). An antichrist will 'exalt himself above God' while saying 'I am exalting God' (Daniel 11.36). He will exalt himself without saying 'I exalt myself'. Hence, these Protestant evangelists naïvely think that 'some guy in a black suit' is going to mysteriously appear and openly say things against Jesus, and they will be there waiting to 'call him out on it'. But what they don't understand is that they themselves have been tricked by Satan (the Antichrist) into acting as a multitude of antichrists: unknowing disciples of Satan who propagate a false persona of the true Christ. All Christian religious leaders today have been tricked to some degree into acting as antichrists that propagate the persona of their hidden leader, the Antichrist, while thinking that they propagate the persona of the true Christ. The antichrists - our Christian religious leaders - have never known the true Christ, and it has been Satan who has 'fed them' his false knowledge (or 'poisonous fruit'), so cleverly disguised as the true knowledge of Jesus. Note also that the Antichrist is Satan; he is not a human being such as the false prophet (the Pope) in Revelation. The Antichrist is the Dragon (Satan) in Revelation, and as 1 John 4.3 says, 'The Antichrist has been in the world since the time of Jesus' death'. The 'Spirit of the Antichrist' is the 'Spirit of Error' that has been preaching 'a false persona of Christ' from the time of Jesus' death; and consequently 'a message of false peace' in the name of Christ. Satan has been in the world since the inception of man, but his false persona of Christ, the Antichrist, could not be classified as such until the true Christ entered our world 2000 years ago. I.e., it is not possible to have an Antichrist until there has been a Christ. Satan is the opposite personality of Christ, so he is the Antichrist who - with a double tongue - speaks the same words as Christ, but breathes false intentions into those words to make them into words that actually oppose Christ; or words that are 'anti' to the true persona of

<u>'Christ'</u>. And of course those *'false intentions of the words of Christ'* are fully embodied in the <u>antichrist</u> gospel of the Catholic Church.

The Catholic hierarchy - with their well trained double tongue - preaches an antichrist gospel that 'in word' looks and sounds like 'the real gospel of Christ', yet 'in interpretation and intention' is a defilement and 'a different gospel' from the one originally preached by Paul and the other Apostles. Remember, 'if you change intention, you change everything', and you may as well have written different words altogether. Thus by changing the intention of Christ's words, the leaders of the Catholic Church are in fact antichrists, who have attached 'Satan's parasitic interpretations and intentions of supremacy and enslavement' to 'Christ's words of equality and freedom'. And so Catholicism itself is based on an <u>antichrist gospel</u> (i.e., their 'Deposit of Faith') that is comprised of 'a sea of false doctrine' that has been attached to the true words of Christ. Their false doctrine is of course the result of centuries of compounded misinterpretations by the Catholic Church Fathers that were instituted in the interest of securing their own power, glory, supremacy, and false authority from God. It must be remembered at all times that **none** of the Catholic Church Fathers personally knew Jesus. The identity we associate with Jesus is a projection of the Catholic Church Fathers' own personalities onto the personality of Jesus, which has resulted in a modern world that knows 'a false, defiled Jesus' who is nothing like 'the real Jesus'. So it is important to realize that 'the compounded misinterpretations of the Catholic Church Fathers' pertains not only to Christ's words, but most importantly, to His true identity or persona. The Catholic religion deceptively labels their false doctrine of compounded misinterpretations as 'sacred tradition' (both oral and written tradition). Hence - remembering that the best lies are the ones closest to the truth - the Catholic antichrist gospel is based on 'the true Gospel' with attached 'sacred tradition'; i.e., 'the truth with attached false doctrine'. And the combination of 'the true Gospel and sacred Catholic tradition' is referred to by the Catholic Church as their 'Deposit of Faith'. By saying we should follow their Deposit of Faith, they have in fact 'gone beyond the teaching of Christ' (the true Gospel) with their sacred tradition, and are in fact 'preaching a different gospel' as Paul warned the Galatians about. And so by admitting that they have gone beyond the true Gospel with their sacred tradition, the Catholic hierarchy has in fact identified themselves as antichrists and false apostles who preach an antichrist gospel. Satan has made them his unknowing servants by taking Scripture, changing its intention, then making them believe that 'his new lie is the truth'; that 'Satan's commandments are Christ's Commandments'. Hence Jesus' words to the Pharisees also apply to the Catholic Church; "You make the word of God (His Commandments) of no effect through your tradition which you have handed down" (Mark 7.13). The Catholic Church, just as the Pharisees 2000 years before them, has 'canceled out' and 'made of no effect' the word and Commandment of God through their 'sacred tradition'. Furthermore, it is quite ironic that the Catholic Church uses sacred tradition to <u>support</u> the very existence of their religion, while <u>Jesus</u> clearly *despises* the entrenched mentality of tradition (Mark 7.8, 9, and 13). Double minds think alike; i.e., Satan and the Catholic hierarchy. With a double tongue and a double mind, the Catholic hierarchy says 'they know Jesus' - although they could not recognize the real Christ (Revelation 19.12) even if He stood in their presence - while blatantly breaking His Commandments in the name of man-made tradition. Thus the Catholic Church's antichrist

gospel or 'Deposit of Faith' - a message of supremacy, enslavement, and consequently false peace - is a **direct result** of the <u>error</u> that they have inherited from their so-called <u>sacred tradition</u>.

In addition, the Catholic hierarchy clearly has **no** true understanding of the very **definition** of the **New** <u>Covenant</u> that eliminates the need for tradition. <u>Tradition</u> is quite simply 'the <u>teaching of man</u> which is handed down one generation to the next'. The New Covenant clearly states that 'no man shall teach his neighbor about God' (Hebrews 8.11); thus eliminating false teachers to establish God Himself as the one true Teacher ('The Holy Spirit will teach you all things' John 14.26). If God's Spirit, the Holy Spirit, teaches us, then why do we need man-made tradition to teach us? The Catholic hierarchy must not have enough faith in God to believe that He is capable of teaching us without them; an insult to God's intelligence. But, Satan has already trained his servants to say 'We are God's helpers, teaching for Him', just as he tricked Peter into thinking that he was 'helping God by keeping Jesus from being crucified'. Furthermore, according to Catholic reasoning, if we have Catholicism's man-made tradition to teach us, we **do not need** the Holy Spirit at all. Thus the 'so-called sacred tradition' of the Catholic Church is an idea that places man-made teaching in a superseded position to the teaching of the Holy Spirit, thereby also placing 'the men who teach Catholic tradition' in a supreme position to others. This is a clear indicator that their man-made traditions are the work of Satan, the Spirit of Error, who wants to be 'supreme like God'. So the Catholic hierarchy is blatantly violating the equality clause of the New Covenant - as well as defiling the very sacrifice of Jesus that sealed the New Covenant - by teaching us their vile traditions which they have used for nearly 2 millennia for supremacy and the enslavement of the entire world. As 1 John 5.19 says, "The whole world lies under the sway of the Wicked One" and his puppet, the Catholic Church.

Why can the Catholic Church not recognize that it is possible to inherit evil oral and written traditions, when the entire Old Testament is a continual message of 'the descendents of God's chosen people falling into error by worshiping false gods and false idols, thereby creating evil traditions? In Deuteronomy chapters 31 and 32, God tells Moses in advance that 'his descendents will forsake God by worshiping false gods' (Deuteronomy 31.16). Yet regardless of this advance warning - known as 'The Song of Moses' - Moses' descendants still fell into error (i.e., Jeroboam's golden calves). Likewise, the Apostles (as well as Jesus Himself, see Matthew 24.5) warned us in advance about antichrists who would introduce false, erroneous doctrine and traditions, yet the Catholic Church still fell into error. As 2 Peter 2.1 says "There will be false teachers among you, who will secretly bring in destructive heresies" and "follow cunningly devised fables" such as the Eucharist (2 Peter 1.16). As if they 'own' the Holy Spirit, the Catholic Church arrogantly says 'God gave us the Holy Spirit as our <u>quarantee</u> that we would never fall into error'. But the Catholic hierarchy cannot see that it is exactly this proud claim of infallibility that keeps them blind to the fact that they are led by 'the Spirit of Error', who disguises himself as 'the Holy Spirit'. Again, Pride = Spiritual Blindness. The Catholic hierarchy blindly insists that they cannot possibly fall into error like Moses' descendants did, but in reality they are the same as the descendants of Moses who were told in advance that they would fall into error. And just like Moses' descendants, their stiff-necked pride and arrogance will not allow them to believe that

'in plain sight' in the Bible. But, the Catholic hierarchy must remember that God's law was sitting right out in plain sight when King Josiah realized that he and his people (i.e., Moses' descendants) had transgressed the Commandments (2 Kings 22.8-13). And when Josiah brought these transgressions before the priests and they ignored him, "He executed all the priests of the high places" (2 Kings 23.20) and destroyed all of the idols and abominations that were made by, among others, Jeroboam and his descendents in Samaria and Bethel. If Catholic priests do not learn from the past mistakes of Josiah's priests - if they 'harden their hearts' to the real truth of Christ, just as Josiah's priests hardened their hearts to the Law of Moses - then unfortunately they will be doomed to repeat those same mistakes. Thus, pride in man-made traditions is not only blinding, but also deadly.

The Catholic hierarchy blindly accepts traditions based on error from antichrists (or false apostles) of the early Catholic Church. The Catholic hierarchy reasons that 'since people like Moses and Paul drew on oral tradition for their writings, the Catholic Church Fathers were also allowed to draw on oral traditions to support their writings and doctrine'. The only problem with this reasoning is that 'the traditions passed down from the Catholic Forefathers blatantly break the law of God'; in particular the 1st and 2nd Commandments. That is like a person claiming that 'it is lawful to kill anyone they want, simply because their grandfather killed anyone he wanted'; i.e., murder is lawful because it is 'family tradition'. If someone tried to claim 'family tradition' as their defense for murder, they would be 'laughed out of court' in today's world. By breaking God's 1st and 2nd Commandments, the Catholic Church is guilty of *crimes against humanity* that are far greater than murder (see 'historical quotes' in Section 3). So, why do we allow the Catholic Church to use 'church tradition' as a defense for crimes that are greater than murder, when we clearly would not allow an individual to justify murder with 'family tradition'? We allow the Catholic Church to commit crimes against humanity because they have attached themselves (including their traditions and ancestors) seamlessly to Jesus like a parasite. I.e., the Catholic Church has *normalized* and thus *justified* their evil acts of *spiritual* and *physical* enslavement by association with 'the good name of Jesus'. And so by the Catholic false prophets and false teachers drawing on antichrist tradition, they have 'made God's laws of no effect through tradition' (Mark 7.13), and quite simply done the will of Satan... all because of the temptation to be 'supreme like God'. Think about it, the Catholic hierarchy has accepted and upheld their sacred tradition throughout the centuries because it has coincidentally made them supreme like God. Their so-called sacred tradition coincidentally gives them control, power, glory, and authority; all the things that Satan lusts after. You can be assured that the Catholic hierarchy would not accept the traditions of their antichrist forefathers if those traditions did not grant them 'the authority over men'. Thus we must realize that, if the traditions of the Catholic Church - both written and oral - break the laws of God, then they are quite simply Wrong and unjust, regardless if they call upon the names of Jesus and God to break those laws, and regardless if they have been breaking those laws for nearly 2000 years. By breaking the laws of God with so-called sacred tradition that is disguised with 'the names of Jesus and God', the Catholic Church has - for motives of control, power, glory, supremacy, and ultimately world domination preached and prophesied 'a message of false righteousness' disguised as 'a message of true

righteousness', 'a message of <u>false justice</u>' <u>disguised as</u> 'a message of true justice', and ultimately '<u>a</u> <u>message of false peace</u>' <u>disguised as</u> 'a message of true peace'.

It says in Jeremiah 14.14, "The Lord said to me, 'The (false) prophets prophesy lies in My name. I have not sent them, commanded them, **nor spoken** to them; they prophesied to you a *false vision*, divination, a worthless thing, and the deceit of their (own) heart". In fact, if you read most any book of the true Prophets in the Old Testament you will find that they were 'the minority voice' against 'the majority voice' of false prophets who spoke a false message of peace, freedom, prosperity, and stability, which they claimed that they had received from God (see 'Hananiah's false message of peace, freedom, prosperity, and stability' in Jeremiah 28.2-4). In actuality the message of the false prophets guaranteed peace and prosperity only if the people submitted to their own prescribed ways; if the false prophets were in a position of supremacy and authority. Think about it, if a false prophet's message of peace and prosperity did not involve 'them being in a position of supremacy and authority', then they would <u>not</u> be preaching it; hence they must be tested. I.e., do false prophets offer peace and prosperity, saying 'they know Jesus', while blatantly breaking His Commandments (1 John 2.4)? Just as a true teacher will teach you that 'you do not need him', a false teacher (or prophet) insists that 'without him or his successors in charge, there will be no peace, freedom, prosperity, or stability'. The false prophets of yesterday, just like the false prophets of today's religions, claimed that 'if everyone was to follow their religion (or false god), then there would be peace'. But then, just as today, the claims of the false prophets were 'a lie in the name of God' used to attain control over the multitudes of people. Thus, one of the best ways to <u>attain control over others</u> (or enslave others) is to 'claim to <u>come in peace</u>, using the name of God and twisting God's laws with a double tongue to make them your own laws'. That is why Jeremiah (8.11) said "(The false prophets) say, Peace, peace! When there is no peace"; which also applies to today's Catholic hierarchy who preach the supremacy of man-made laws and doctrine (i.e., their antichrist gospel, 'the Deposit of Faith'), thereby 'hindering peace while claiming to come in peace'. Men who preach a message of peace at the cost of submission to them cannot be trusted. Their message is one of false peace because the price for that peace is enslavement to them. I.e., the cost of 'the Catholic Church's peace and unity' comes at the cost of 'enslavement to them' - 'carrying their heavy loads' of inherited sin and error (Matthew 23.4), not to mention physical workloads and fighting their wars - under the disguise of 'being enslaved to God and carrying the cross of Christ'. The cost of 'the Catholic Church's peace and unity' comes at the cost of their supremacy over us. Thus without equality, their message is really a message of false peace, preached by false prophets who 'prophesy a false vision, divination, a worthless thing, and the deceit of their (own) heart'. There will never be true peace if it involves submission to the men of the Catholic Church or the leaders of any man-made religion (i.e., false god) because supremacy hinders peace, while equality creates peace. As many times as the Catholic Church has offered people 'the peace of Christ', it is a false peace because 'their peace' means 'enslavement and inferiority to them'; which has ultimately caused nearly 2000 years of 'division, war, and hate'.

Just as Jesus was 'betrayed with a kiss of false peace' (Matthew 26.48-49), so too has humanity been betrayed (although blindly) by Catholicism's message of false peace; essentially 'kissing us on the

cheek', then handing us over to be beaten, enslaved, and murdered for nearly 2000 years. And so the last 2000 years have been a period of darkness and ignorance; a period of 'division, war, and hate' due to the Catholic Church's idolatry. Regardless of the Catholic hierarchy's repeated pleas for peace in the name of Christ, it is their defilement of 'the name, persona, and true message of Christ' - which has of course been spoken from behind the **Eucharist** - that **has kept the world from realizing peace for the** last 2000 years. 'The evil tenants of God's vineyard' (the Catholic Forefathers) cast Jesus, 'the Light', out of the vineyard after killing Him 2000 years ago (Mark 12.8); so it has been 'night' (John 9.4) or 'darkness' for 2000 years. But, when Jesus returns, 'He will bring to light the hidden things of darkness' (1 Corinthians 4.5). Thus, the 2nd coming of Jesus represents 'the end of this present age of darkness' when Catholicism and subsequently every other false god (religion) will be 'brought to light' and destroyed (i.e., 'the destruction of the temple at the end of the age'; Matthew 24.1-3 and see Section 5.3). The return of Jesus - 'the Bright and Morning Star' - to the vineyard represents 'the Dawn', when we will leave our present 'age of darkness' and enter a new 'age of light'; or when 'the day will dawn and the Morning Star rises' (2 Peter 1.19). Do not believe the Catholic hierarchy when they assert that they are 'ministers of light and peace'. The truth is that for 2000 years it is really they who have been 'Satan's unknowing ministers of darkness and war', betraying us with 'a kiss of false peace'. And it is really they who have been Satan's false prophets, preaching 'a message of false light', and consequently '<u>a message of **false peace**</u>'.

Jesus is our Savior because, as already mentioned, 'He takes away the sin of the world': the idolatrous practices of our religious leaders which are rooted in their 'wanting to be supreme like God'. Jesus did not come 'to forgive our sins' or 'to start a new religion'; that is, our sins are forgiven 'as we forgive others' (Matthew 6.12, and see Section 9). Thus upon Jesus' return, 'all will be fulfilled' (Matthew 5.18) and the world will understand Jesus' true intentions and the true Good News, thereby 'removing the sin of idolatry from the world'. By removing the sin of idolatry, we will stop the blind and senseless 'killing and hating of one another', thereby allowing us to live in true peace. The idea of 'Jesus being our Savior' has been something portrayed by the religious leaders as 'lofty and esoteric', that only they, the transcendent few can begin to grasp. But at the time of His return - 'the end of this present age of darkness' - it will be obvious to all that 'Jesus is our Savior' because His words and true intentions (the true Good News of the New Covenant) will break down all the temples and religions (or false gods) that are 'the cause of blind sinning' and 'the cause of division, war, and hate'. It will be quite obvious to all that 'Jesus is our Savior' because His true Good News of the New Covenant - 'a message of true equality and true freedom' - will bring about true World peace; not the false peace that the Catholic Church has been preaching and practicing for the last 2000 years.

5. Three Major Prophecies of 'The End Time' with Three Major Common Threads

The prophecy of '<u>The End of the Age'</u> in Matthew chapter 24 is closely tied with two other major prophecies in the Bible. Those two prophecies are '<u>The Abomination of Desolation</u>' in Daniel chapters 11 and 12 and '<u>The Image of the Beast</u>' in Revelation chapters 13 and 18-20. All <u>three</u> prophecies have 'three major common threads' that tie them together. Those three major common threads are:

- 1. *All <u>three</u>* prophecies speak of a '<u>false image of Jesus</u>' that gives rise to widespread desolation, wars, famines, pestilences, captivity, and/or death.
- 2. **All <u>three</u>** prophecies speak of <u>worldwide deception</u> by false prophets and/or false christs, who speak lies from behind their 'false image of Jesus'.
- 3. *All three* prophecies speak of the 'End Time' when a <u>Great Tribulation</u> or 'worldwide correction' will occur. This tribulation or correction corresponds with the <u>return of Christ</u>, who will 'cast out and cut off' the false prophets and false christs who deceive and scatter the nations i.e., cause senseless 'division, war, and hate' in the name of Christ.

Remember Satan's main objective is to cause 'division, war, and hate' (i.e., to destroy humanity) by stealing the identity of Jesus, and then speaking lies in His name. Satan is able to sow his poisonous lies by speaking them from behind the false image of Jesus known as the Eucharist; which is also 'the Abomination of Desolation', 'the Image of the Beast', and consequently 'the source of division, war, and hate'. By creating a false image of Jesus, Satan has, for nearly 2000 years, tricked men into 'speaking for <u>him'</u>, while <u>believing</u> that they are 'speaking for Jesus'. In essence, they are tricked into 'speaking the doctrine of Satan and advancing his glory' under the disguise of 'speaking the doctrine of God and advancing God's glory'. Thus, by doing so, Satan has, for nearly 2000 years, convinced men to unknowingly create 'division, war, and hate', while blindly believing that they are working towards 'unity, peace, and love'. It is important to recognize that, in these prophecies, the ones responsible for this 'blasphemy and deception that causes worldwide desolation' are a group of people (false prophets and false christs) who profess the name of Jesus as Savior and Son of God; a group of people who exalt themselves above Christ by 'using the name of Christ'. This rules out Islam, Judaism, Hinduism, or any other religion besides Christianity. Therefore, the only Christian religion with the unity and power needed to deceive the entire world - and claiming to have the sole ability to 'produce an actual Christ' (i.e., the Eucharist, a false image of Christ) - is Catholicism. The following is a summary and commentary on these three major prophecies.

5.1 Prophecy of the Abomination of Desolation

This prophecy starts in Daniel chapter 11 and continues through the end of Daniel chapter 12.

"A vile person (the King of the North) shall arise. They will not give him the honor of royalty, but he shall come in peaceably and seize the kingdom by intrigue. Then he shall act deceitfully. With the force of a flood, the people and the Prince of the covenant shall be swept away before him and be broken. He (the King of the North) shall show regard for those who forsake the holy covenant. And forces shall be mustered by him, and they shall defile the sanctuary fortress; then they shall take away the daily sacrifices, and place there the abomination of desolation. Those who do wickedly against the covenant, he shall corrupt with flattery; but the people who know their God shall be strong, and carry out great exploits. And those of the people who understand shall instruct many; yet for many days they shall fall by sword and flame, by captivity and plundering... until the time of the end."

"The the King shall do according to his will: he shall <u>exalt and magnify himself above every god</u>, shall speak blasphemies against the God of gods, and <u>shall prosper until the wrath has been accomplished</u>; for what has been determined shall be done. He shall <u>regard neither the God of his fathers nor the desire of women</u>, nor regard any god; for he shall exalt himself above them <u>all</u>... with <u>a god</u> (i.e., the false god 'Catholicism', which is built upon the Abomination of Desolation) his fathers did not know; honoring it (the god) with gold and silver, with precious stones and pleasant things. Thus he shall <u>act against</u> the <u>strongest fortresses</u> with a <u>foreign god</u>, which <u>he shall acknowledge</u>, and advance its glory; and he shall cause his people to <u>rule over</u> many, and divide the land for gain. Yet, <u>he shall come to his end</u>, and no one will help him."

"At (the time of the end) Michael (i.e., Jesus) shall stand up, the great Prince who stands watch over the sons of your people; and there shall be a time of trouble (i.e., a Great Tribulation), such as never was since there was a nation, even to that time. And at that time your people shall be delivered, everyone who is found written in the book. Those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the firmament. When the power of the holy people has been completely shattered, all these things shall be finished. None of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand."

Commentary on the Prophecy of the Abomination of Desolation

You must first be aware of how the Catholic Church reads this prophecy. Do not believe their false interpretation that 'the daily sacrifice' is their 'Holy Sacrifice of the Mass'; otherwise known as the 'Eucharist'. They will try to confuse you - because they themselves are confused - by saying 'When the Eucharist is taken away, is 'when' the Abomination of Desolation will be put in its place'. Wrong, the Eucharist is the Abomination of Desolation that has already been in place for almost 1900 years.

The holy covenant was God's covenant with Moses and the Israelites. Part of that covenant involved a sanctuary - also called the holy place or the tabernacle - where they offered a continual animal sacrifice. This was called the daily sacrifice; one in the morning and the other at twilight (Exodus 29.38-43). On a table in the sanctuary (i.e., holy place or tabernacle) they would also keep a continual 'showbread' with a wine offering. The showbread was also called 'bread of the Face' or 'bread of the Presence of God'. You can see right away that it is only a short stretch for a 2nd century group of Jewish Christians (i.e., the early Catholic Church) to take this 'bread of the Presence of God', combine it with the Gospels of Jesus, and then claim that the bread is now 'the true presence of Jesus'; as in the Eucharist. And so the general idea of how the Abomination of Desolation was initially instituted is that, once the daily sacrifices were ended in around 135 AD, Jewish Christians - eager to continue in their Jewish traditions, but also wanting to include a remembrance of Jesus - were tricked by Satan into instituting the Eucharist; which of course they thought was an honor to God and to Jesus, just as their 'bread of the Presence of God' had been for 1600 years. But they, just as their future generations have done, underestimated the deceptive brilliance of Satan and his double tongue lies that he places side-by-side with the truth. They underestimated the *unfathomable* desolation ('division, war, and hate') that a false image of Jesus (the Abomination) would cause. They underestimated <u>the lies</u> that vain men would speak from <u>behind</u> an image of God in the interest of their own authority and supremacy; which of course is exactly what the Catholic Church has done for nearly 2000 years from behind a false image of Jesus (i.e., the Abomination of Desolation).

This prophecy states that they (the King of the North and the people that he corrupts with flattery) 'shall take away the daily sacrifices, and place there the abomination of desolation'. The daily sacrifices were permanently ended after the 3rd Jewish Roman War of 132-135 AD when Emperor Hadrian forbade the practice of Judaism. This corresponds with a time approximate to the beginnings of the Catholic Church. It is very coincidental that Justin the Martyr, a Catholic Church Father, gave one of the first accounts of the Eucharist in around 150 AD. Justin was born and raised in Samaria as a pagan, and thus was familiar with pagan rituals; i.e., Samaritans were notorious for worshiping idols such as 'the golden calf' instituted by Jeroboam (1 Kings 12.28) in around 900 BC. From this time forward, Samaritans were known to believe in God, but to also worship false idols and false gods; just like the Catholic Church. Additionally, when Daniel wrote this prophecy in roughly 600 BC, Samaria was known as the capital of the Northern Kingdom. So 'connecting all the dots': 1) Justin the Martyr was a pagan Samaritan. 2) Samaria was the capital of the Northern Kingdom which corresponds to the King of the North in this prophecy. 3) Justin turned Catholic (i.e., Jewish Christian) and started his own school where he taught in Rome around 150 AD. 150 AD is also when he wrote one of the first accounts of the Eucharist. It is also

important to note that it was very <u>common</u> for <u>paganism</u>, <u>Christianity</u>, <u>and Judaism</u> to <u>intermingle</u> in this time period; the lines of division among religions were quite blurred. <u>4)</u> <u>150 AD</u> also corresponds <u>exactly</u> to <u>when the daily sacrifices were discontinued</u> (<u>after</u> 135 AD when Hadrian slaughtered the Jews and <u>made Judaism illegal</u>). <u>5)</u> Thus <u>the school of thought surrounding Justin the Martyr in Rome</u> around the year 150 AD was somehow either directly, or indirectly, <u>responsible for instituting the</u> <u>Abomination of Desolation; i.e., the Eucharist</u>.

To an early Jewish Christian sect (i.e., the early Catholic Church) that was not able to continue the daily sacrifices because they were outlawed by Hadrian, the Eucharist must have seemed like a quite 'valid' sacrifice' that would replace their traditional daily sacrifices. (Note also that from 1 Samuel 21.4-5 'the showbread and the Eucharist' both use the term 'consecrated bread' or 'holy bread' which shows the previously mentioned intermingling of religions.) You must realize that Satan 'changed the intention' of the words in Hebrews 10.11-14 to trick the early Jewish Christians into believing that, if they continually offered Jesus as a sacrifice (i.e., 'the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass' or the Eucharist), God would see it as a valid replacement for their former 'continual daily sacrifices' (Exodus 29.42) that they could no longer offer. But Jesus was the 'one Sacrifice that was valid forever'; no other sacrifices were needed and any attempt to duplicate Jesus' sacrifice is not 'holy', as Satan would imply, but actually quite defiled. And so the early Catholic Church blindly and ignorantly went from 'continually sacrificing animals' to thinking that they were 'continually sacrificing the actual body of Christ'. Thus Satan was able to institute his false idol by disguising it with the name of Jesus. Satan instituted the Abomination of Desolation by calling it (i.e., the Eucharist) Jesus.

So, to 'Defile the sanctuary, take away the daily sacrifices, and place there the Abomination of Desolation', is to 'discontinue God's covenant with Moses and the Israelites by placing - in the same sanctuary, tabernacle, or holy place (see Matthew 24.15) where the daily sacrifices were performed - an idol (an abomination in the Old Testament is any carved idol or image) that will cause desolation and sorrow for many generations (i.e., 'many days')'. What is hidden from our minds is that 'this image of desolation' is 'a false image of Jesus', and the image or 'idol that causes desolation' is the Eucharist that has already been in place for over 1850 years. Thus the institution of the Abomination of Desolation is simply the placement of the Eucharist - by the Catholic Church Fathers in around the year 150 AD - into the sanctuary (or 'holy place' as Jesus says in Matthew 24.15) where the daily sacrifices were performed. And so can we not go to any Catholic Mass and in fact see the Abomination of Desolation standing up on the altar, and in the sanctuary (i.e., tabernacle or 'holy place')? Notice also that the Abomination of Desolation defiled both Old and New Covenants. "(The King of the North and the people that he corrupts with flattery) shall forsake the holy (Old) covenant (with Moses and the Israelites)." And also "With the force of a flood, the Prince (Jesus or Michael who are one in the same Person; see Section 18) of the (New) covenant shall be swept away". The institution of the Abomination of Desolation some 1850 years ago by the early Catholic Church Fathers (who are represented by the King of the North and his people) marked the renouncement ('shall forsake') of the Old Covenant and the defilement ('swept away') of the New Covenant all at once; officially making the Catholic hierarchy 'the evil tenants who <u>cast Jesus out of the vineyard</u>' to gain control over God's people.

So they did "wickedly against the covenant", but notice that they did 'wickedly' because they were corrupted by the King's flattery; 'he corrupted with flattery' or by 'the speaking and twisting of the word of God'. They were corrupted, deceived, and enslaved by flattering speech and words that sounded like words of divinity; i.e., reverent blasphemy. They were deceived not by words that openly oppose God, but rather by 'God's own words that were distorted with changed intentions'; i.e., misinterpretations of Scripture. Thus, the King used reverent blasphemy and flattering, exquisite words of false divinity in order to deceive and corrupt; remember that words and names are utterly deceiving. As Daniel 11.21 says "(The King of the North) shall come in peaceably and seize the kingdom by intrigue". The King, or the 'hidden kingship' of the Papacy, came in speaking 'peaceable' words of God (and Jesus), and seized them with the intrigue of 'the supposed true presence of Jesus'; the Eucharist. He seized them with the intrigue of a false miracle (i.e., transubstantiation), thereby instituting the Abomination of Desolation by flattery, not force.

The Catholic Church will claim that the Abomination of Desolation was a statue of the Roman Emperor Hadrian (and another of Jupiter) that was placed in the sanctuary of the temple in Jerusalem. The only problem with this assertion is that a statue of Hadrian would have been placed in the sanctuary by force; not flattery. The Jewish Christians obviously would not have accepted or worshipped a statue of Hadrian knowing that this would be a **blatant violation** of the 1st Commandment. Thus a statue of Hadrian could not feasibly be an idol that would cause desolation for many generations. I.e., if people could recognize the Abomination of Desolation as a false idol, then it would not be the Abomination of Desolation. So the Abomination of Desolation is a false idol that **no one could recognize** as being the Abomination of Desolation, thereby easily deceiving the multitudes; i.e., it is something evil that was openly accepted as being **good**, making it a beautifully **disguised** false idol from behind which Satan could speak his <u>lies</u> to the **entire world**. <u>If the sanctuary was "corrupted with flattery"</u> then it means that the Abomination of Desolation was **openly accepted** into the sanctuary as 'a valid replacement for the daily sacrifices' by the use of exquisite words of false divinity and reverent blasphemy; or by intrigue. So this was a covert 'swap'; not overt, as in a statue of Hadrian. The people of the early Catholic Church obviously could not see the potential for desolation because the Eucharist had the name of Jesus attached to it. And since they were willing to openly accept the Eucharist, Satan was able to walk right through the front door as if he was God. Hence a statue of Hadrian cannot cause deception and desolation for countless generations, but 'a false Jesus' hiding behind 'the name of the real Jesus' can very easily cause unfathomable deception and desolation for many generations. The fact that the Eucharist is a hidden idol - hiding behind the name of Jesus - is 'what makes the Eucharist the Abomination that causes Desolation'. And the fact that the Eucharist was put in place of the daily sacrifices by flattery, **not** force, is how it has remained hidden for so long. Thus, the Abomination of Desolation has deceived many generations for 'many days' by 'flattery', not force.

They (or 'the King and those who did wickedly against the covenant') also fooled or deceived us with <u>"gold and silver, with precious stones and pleasant things"</u>. Walk into any Catholic cathedral today; do you not see "gold and silver, with precious stones and pleasant things"? Remember that Satan has a silver tongue speaking pleasant lies. If a priest 'drank out of a <u>paper cup</u> instead of a <u>golden chalice</u>', 'wore a t-shirt instead of <u>vestments</u>', and 'consecrated the Eucharist on the tailgate of his truck', would

Carpenter is not golden! The Catholic Church has set up the ultimate power position with their 'many cathedrals, gold and silver, precious stones, and pleasant things'. I.e., Catholicism has a 'lock' on our Visual senses, with paintings, statues, large temples, golden chalices, golden keys, vestments, etc., thereby visually causing us to submit to their authority. Think of a business that has a fleet of trucks, many locations, and men dressed in fine suits; they have established for themselves a power position. Are we not more likely to listen to and respect 'a man in a suit who's driving a BMW, and who's sitting in a million dollar office', than 'a man wearing a t-shirt who's driving an old Ford truck'? And so this is the same reason that we listen to and respect the Catholic hierarchy. But we must remember that, if Jesus was here today, He would be 'a Carpenter, wearing a t-shirt and driving an old Ford truck'.

It is also important to note that the King of the North is **not** a King in the traditional sense. That is, he does **not** have "the honor of royalty"; i.e., he does not inherit the throne by merely being 'the oldest blood son' of the previous King. The title of King (as in Revelation 16.14) is meant to symbolize the hidden kingship of all religious leaders because of their influence over the mindset of society's boundary between right and wrong. In this particular prophecy, the hidden kingship is that of the Papacy of the Catholic Church; something that can be attained regardless of one's family lineage or bloodline. Thus the Pope does <u>not</u> have 'the honor of royalty'. Additionally, we know that 'the King of the North in this prophecy is the Pope' because it says 'the King will exalt himself above every god, as well as the one true God'. The Pope does this of course with his well trained double tongue, saying 'I am not Christ (no), but I speak infallibly for Christ (yes)', thereby essentially exalting himself above God and Jesus, without actually saying 'I exalt myself above God and Jesus'. I.e., the Pope's 'exalting himself above God and Jesus' is hidden by his double tongue; 'he says it without actually saying it'. Think about it, most devout Catholics would consider negative comments against the Pope and his Church as 'blasphemy against the Holy Spirit'. Does that not show how this man has exalted himself as God, without actually calling himself God? And finally we know that 'the King of the North in this prophecy is the Pope' because it articulates that 'the King does not desire women'. Does this not perfectly describe the *celibate* Catholic Pope and his *celibate* hierarchy? Besides, what other 'King' in today's world, other than the Catholic Pope, does not openly 'desire women'?

This prophecy tells us that the King (the hidden kingship of the Papacy) will "rule over many, and divide the land" by advancing the glory of a "foreign god"; that foreign (or false) god is ultimately Catholicism itself, which has been built upon the institution of the Abomination of Desolation. And so by advancing the glory of the Eucharist, and thereby Catholicism itself, the Catholic Church has 'plundered, enslaved, and killed' for "many days"; with 'many days' corresponding to 'the 2000 years that the Catholic evil tenants have run God's vineyard' and 'the length of time described by Jesus in the prophecy of 'The End of the Age'' (see Section 5.3). Thus, it is written in this prophecy that Catholicism will 'prosper until the wrath has been accomplished... at the time of the end'. The Catholic Church has 'advanced and prospered' by stealing and hiding behind the name of Jesus. No other name on this earth can command such power and respect as the name of Jesus. The Abomination of Desolation, the false idol that the Catholic Forefathers deceptively named 'Jesus', has been used as the control symbol (or control 'image'

in Revelation 13.15) by which the Catholic Church has been able to "rule over many", "divide the land", and "prosper"; they have commanded unrighteous power and respect by 'stealing the name of Jesus' and then 'hiding behind a false idol named Jesus'. If you think that it is impossible for people to worship false gods and idols while simultaneously 'prospering and ruling over many', look at the historical parallel between the Catholic Church and the Egyptians of Moses' day. The Egyptians, while worshipping false gods, simultaneously prospered and enslaved the Israelites. Likewise the Catholic Church, while worshipping the false god and idol 'Catholicism and the Eucharist', has simultaneously prospered and enslaved the entire world. But the Egyptians advanced and prospered only until the wrath of God brought about plaques and death so that the Israelites could make an exodus from their cruel bondage in Egypt. Likewise, the Catholic Church will advance and prosper only until the Great Tribulation brings about plaques and death so that we too can make an exodus from our cruel bondage.

The hidden kingship of the Papacy of the Catholic Church has deceived, prospered, and enslaved for nearly 2000 years through 'the use and manipulation' of a false Jesus; the Abomination of Desolation. But God's Day of justice ('the Day of the Lord') will come swiftly and His wrath will be undeniable; just as His wrath was against the Egyptians. At "the time of the end" Michael (or Jesus) shall stand up representing the 2nd coming of Jesus - and there will be "a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation" (or a **Great Tribulation**) so that "your people (we) shall be delivered" from cruel bondage. I.e., at 'the time of the end' there will be a correction to attain freedom and peace. Notice that this 'time of trouble' or correction occurs when the "power of the holy people has been completely shattered". Or 'the time of trouble' will occur when 'the ones who speak the true Good News of the New Covenant' will be the minority voice that is completely drowned out by the majority voice: the multitude of false prophets and false teachers speaking the Anti-Good News. Coincidentally, we live in a time such as that; when the true Good News has been 'completely shattered' by the multitude of false prophets who break the New Covenant by **teaching** us their lies about God. Thus we are at "the time of the end" when there will be a correction (i.e., 'a time of trouble' or a time of God's wrath) that leads to our exodus from the cruel bondage that is a direct result of the Catholic Church and their institution of the Abomination of **Desolation**.

5.2 Prophecy of the Image of the Beast

This prophecy begins in Revelation chapter 13, with 'the fall of Babylon', 'the return of Christ', and 'the 1000 years of peace' occurring in Revelation chapters 18-20.

"Then I (John) stood on the sand of the sea. And I saw a **Beast** (the first Beast) rising up out of the sea, having 7 heads and 10 horns, and on his (10) horns (were) 10 crowns, and on his (7) heads a **blasphemous name**. The Dragon (**Satan**) **gave him his power**, his throne, and great authority. **All the world marveled and followed the Beast thereby worshiping the Dragon who gave authority to the Beast**. They worshiped the Beast saying "Who is like the Beast? Who is able to make war with him?" The Beast opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme His name and **His tabernacle**. **Authority was given to him over every tribe, people, tongue, and nation**. **All who dwell on the earth will worship him**, whose names have not been written in the Book of Life of the Lamb. **He who leads into captivity shall go into captivity.**"

"Then I saw another (second) beast coming up out of the earth, and he had 2 horns like a lamb and spoke like a dragon. He exercises all the authority of the (first) Beast, and causes the earth and those who dwell in it to worship the (first) Beast. He performs great signs, and deceives those who dwell on the earth by those signs which he was granted to do in the sight of the (first) Beast, telling those who dwell on the earth to make an image to the (first) Beast. The second beast was granted power to breathe life into the Image of the (first) Beast, that the Image of the (first) Beast should both speak and cause as many as would not worship the Image of the Beast to be killed. He causes all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and slave, to receive a mark on their right hand or on their foreheads. No one may buy or sell except one who has the mark of the (first) Beast or the number of his (the second beast's) name. Let him who has understanding calculate the number of the (second) beast, for it is the number of a man: His number is 666."

In the following chapters (18-20), Babylon (Rome) - where 'the two beasts' reside - falls and is burned in one day as the result of a Great Tribulation (i.e., wrath) from God (see chapter 16). At this point Christ, 'the Word of God', rides out of heaven on a white horse to judge the nations and make war. "Out of His mouth goes a sharp sword, that with it He should strike the nations (representing the Battle of Armageddon). He Himself will rule them (representing 'the marriage of the Lamb') with a rod of iron." Christ proceeds to capture the Beast and the false prophet (the second beast) who worked signs and deceived those who worshiped the Image of the Beast. The two beasts are then cast alive into the lake of fire burning with brimstone. Then an angel comes down from heaven, seizes the Dragon (Satan) and binds him for 1000 years in the bottomless pit so that 'he should deceive the nations no more' until the 1000 years are finished. After 'the 1000 years of peace' are finished, Satan will be released for a short time. At that point God will throw Satan into the lake of fire and brimstone with the two beasts where they are to be tormented forever and ever. These events complete 'the building of the New Jerusalem (i.e., the New Kingdom)'.

Commentary on the Prophecy of the Image of the Beast

In biblical prophecies they often use <u>symbolism</u> in order to <u>disguise</u> the true meaning so that it will hopefully survive without being altered by 'the people about whom the prophecy is written'. If the Catholic Church knew that this prophecy was written about them, they probably would've destroyed it long ago (just as they did to the Nag Hammadi Scriptures). This prophecy was written about <u>the Catholic Church (the first Beast)</u>, the Pope (the second beast), and the Eucharist (the Image of the Beast or 'the <u>control symbol</u>' which represents the false god 'Catholicism'). The Eucharist is the <u>single defining</u> <u>image</u> of the Catholic Church and all of its false doctrine; i.e., the Eucharist is 'the Image of the Catholic Church'. Thus, if the Catholic Church is the (first) Beast, then the <u>Eucharist</u> is 'the Image of the Beast'.

In Revelation chapter 17 it is explained that 'the 7 heads and 10 horns' of the Beast all represent kings **or kingdoms of the earth**; some that have fallen, and others yet to come, from the time when John wrote this prophecy. To clarify, Revelation 17.10 says, concerning the '7 heads or kingdoms', '5 kingdoms have fallen, 1 kingdom is presently in place, and 1 kingdom is yet to come'; which is referring to 'Rome' being the present (i.e., when Revelation was written) kingdom, the 'Roman Catholic Empire' being 'the kingdom yet to come', and 5 previous major kingdoms to Rome (i.e., Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon, Persia, etc.) being 'the 5 fallen kingdoms'. So the Catholic Church (i.e., Roman Catholic Empire or kingdom) is represented by 1 of the 7 heads; recognizing that, just as the Catholic Church had the ability to send hundreds of thousands of their own soldiers into battle during the Crusades, a kingdom and a religious institution can be 'one in the same'. The 10 horns (which corresponds to 'the 10 toes of the statue' in Daniel 2.41-43) represent 10 kings or kingdoms - i.e., major religions and/or religious leaders - that have been influenced by the Catholic Church; hence the 10 horns would all be assumed to be coming from this one head, with Daniel 7.20 supporting this. Now of course many read this prophecy and do not think of religious leaders or their institutions as being kings or kingdoms, but as already mentioned, the religious leaders are 'the **hidden** kings of the earth'. The religious leaders influence the mindset of society in terms of 'what is true right and true wrong'. But since they have eaten Satan's poisonous fruit of false knowledge, they are blind and without 'the knowledge of true right and true wrong', consequently misleading the multitudes of people into 'error that is disquised as righteousness' by 'blaspheming God's name and the temple (i.e., 'tabernacle') that uses His name'. In essence, the religious leaders rule over the elected officials - who we think are the 'real kings' - without ever having to be elected by the people. By the religious leaders influencing laws from behind the scenes, they in fact rule the multitudes indirectly, in the hidden realm. Thus the religious leaders are 'hidden kings' (and 'the kings' being referred to in this prophecy), secretly installing 'laws and governments for Satan' that are disguised as 'the laws and governments of God'; although ironically, by being unknowing servants of Satan, the hidden kings are ultimately pawns. Hence, the multitudes of people - 'every tribe, people, tongue, and nation' - are unknowingly led by the religious leaders (i.e., hidden kings), who are themselves unknowingly led by Satan; and why this prophecy says "All the world marveled and followed the Beast (the religious leaders and their religions) thereby worshiping the Dragon who gave authority to the Beast". And so by using the Beast to get the whole world to follow him, Revelation 12.9 calls Satan "The great Dragon who deceives the whole world".

Since the **Eucharist** or 'Image of the Beast' represents the source of the Beast's power, the Catholic Church is the main Beast itself, and is represented by '1 of the 7 heads on the Beast'. Revelation 17.11 says 'The Beast (the Catholic Church) is himself the 8th king (or kingdom), is represented by 1 of the 7 heads, and will go off to perdition' with the false prophet (Revelation 19.20); noting that the Pope is the false prophet and is also 'a second beast' unto himself (Revelation 13.11). The 'horns of the Beast' (assumed to <u>all</u> be coming from this <u>one</u> head) are various leaders of world religions, or the religions themselves, which are A) in some way a product or 'the fruit' of Catholic idolatrous seeds that were planted nearly 2000 years ago, or **B)** have been **influenced** by Catholicism's idolatry. Many religious leaders throughout history have called the Catholic Church 'the Beast', but what they can't see is that they and their religions are part of the Beast. I.e., the Catholic Church is either 'what their religion came <u>from</u>' or 'why their religion is still in existence'. Therefore the Catholic Church is the main Beast, and our other religious leaders and/or their religion - which are in some way a product of the Catholic Church's poisoned inheritance - are represented by the 'the horns of the Beast'. Thus, all of the religious leaders (or *hidden kings* and *their kingdoms*) will be called together by the Pope's <u>message of false peace</u> (who is himself a hidden king and the false prophet) to be **defeated** by Jesus (the King of kings) at the Battle of Armageddon. Revelation 16.13-16 says 'An unclean spirit came out of the mouth of the false prophet (the Pope). It is the spirit of demons which goes out to the (hidden) kings of the earth to gather (or **assemble)** them together to make war with Jesus (the King of kings) at the great Battle of Armageddon.'

Additionally, it is no coincidence that Armageddon means 'an assembly taking place at a range of hills or mountains', Rome is known as 'The City of 7 Hills', and Revelation 17.9 says that "The 7 heads (of the Beast) are 7 mountains on which the woman (or harlot) sits". There are 7 hills in Rome, where the Papacy (i.e., the false prophet) is headquartered, and these '7 hills' represent 'the 7 heads of the Beast'. If the Pope's message of false peace goes out to assemble and unify the hidden kings of the world with Catholicism - which is echoed in Zephaniah 3.8; 'The Lord's determination is to gather the nations to His assembly of kingdoms' - then 'the Battle of Armageddon' literally means 'the Battle of the assembled hidden kings which takes place at the 7 hills of Rome'; noting of course that this is not necessarily a physical assembly, but a spiritual assembly or unification of the hidden kings with the Beast so that 'they are all of one mind' (Revelation 17.17). And so if this is essentially 'a battle between the Beast and the Lamb' - of which the Lamb is destined to conquer the Beast (Revelation 17.14) - then 'the Battle of Armageddon' translated into modern terms simply means 'the Battle between the Catholic Church and Jesus'.

'The woman (or 'harlot') who rides the Beast' in Revelation chapter 17 represents 'nonspecifically' any leader (i.e., various rulers, leaders, kings, and queens) of the last 'roughly' 2000 years who has ruled, either knowingly or unknowingly, under the influence of the hidden kings of our religions. These make up a sort of hidden Roman Empire that is not identified by any Outward unifying name; as they are unknowingly united to do Satan's will of destroying humanity. So the hidden Roman Empire (or harlot) is ultimately 'all the leaders of the world's governments'; which are ultimately run by (i.e. 'they ride') the hidden kings of the earth, our religious leaders (i.e., the Beast). Think about it. Consider how

many <u>senators</u>, <u>congressmen</u>, <u>judges</u>, etc., are elected, at least in part, because of their <u>affiliation</u> with a church, a preacher, a bishop, etc. Therefore, the harlot represents 'all the leaders who have bowed to Satan's false gods' (i.e., the religions that make up the Beast) and have thus been given power and authority from Satan over kingdoms, nations, principalities, corporations, etc. In addition, the 'many waters' on which the harlot sits represents those followers 'drunk on the power and authority of the leaders' (i.e., 'the inhabitants of the earth were drunk on the wine of the fornication between our hidden kings and the harlot'; Revelation 17.2). So just as Satan tells Jesus in Luke 4.5-6, 'You can have the authority over all the kingdoms of the world if You (Jesus) will worship me (Satan)', Satan has given all the 'leaders of the harlot' authority over nations and principalities because of their affiliation with the religions of his Beast; realizing that it is ultimately **false** authority so that Satan can **use** them as blind puppets to cause desolation from behind the scenes. Throughout the Bible (see Hosea 4.17-18) those who have bowed to 'false idols, false gods, or false prophets' (i.e., Satan) are considered harlots because God and/or Jesus is their true Husband, and they have gone off and fornicated with Satan, thereby committing <u>adultery</u> against God (i.e., idolatry). Thus 'the woman riding the Beast' is also a harlot because she (i.e., various rulers, leaders, kings, and queens) has also fornicated with 'the false gods (i.e., our religions) or false husbands (i.e., our religious leaders) that are represented by the head and horns of the Beast'. As a note, it is important to realize that the Pope was an actual King, commanding hundreds of thousands of soldiers during the Crusades, thereby making him both 'part of the harlot and part of the Beast', and therefore also realizing that 'the harlot and the Beast' are quite intertwined, with the lines between 'church and state' being rather blurred. This prophecy gives the harlot the name **Babylon** - which is **synonymous** with **the Roman Empire** (see 1 Peter 5.13) - because it was the Roman Empire that, in 313 AD, originally started 'riding the Catholic Church' with motives of 'having absolute authority over all the kingdoms of the world' (i.e., world domination). Coincidentally, Roman Catholicism still bears the namesake of the Roman Empire, is still located in Rome, the Pope is still referred to as the Roman Pontiff after his pagan Roman predecessor Pontifex Maximus, and Roman Catholicism still practices pagan Roman extravagant superstitions and 'pseudo bloody rituals' that indicate the *intermingling* of pagan Roman worship and early Christianity (i.e., the Eucharist, or 'Holy Sacrifice of the Mass', is a 'false bloody ritual' reminiscent of Catholicism's pagan roots). Thus, the Roman Empire or 'Babylon', who originally started 'riding the Catholic Church' for 'absolute authority over all the kingdoms of the world', represents the origin of the name of the harlot. But as the official Roman Empire started to dissolve, say after 400 AD, it is the 'hidden Roman Empire' - riding the 'Roman Catholic Empire' or 'Beast' - that began to take its place, and it is the hidden Roman Empire that still rules today, remaining undetected, as it is ruled by many leaders, and ultimately their hidden kings, who are <u>spread out</u> all over the world, so that <u>both</u> the *hidden Roman Empire* and the *Beast* have <u>no</u> **outward** unifying name. That is, the <u>hidden Roman Empire</u> and the <u>Beast</u> 'are hidden' because their power is divided among many kings and leaders who are not formally united (see Daniel 2.42-43 where it says 'They will not adhere to one another'), yet they are unknowingly united by Satan, all blindly doing his will, and all ultimately working towards the destruction of humanity... and not even realizing it.

The Eucharist - which the Catholic hidden kings use as 'a control symbol' to ultimately control all the nations for Satan from behind the scenes - is the single defining image at the core of the Catholic religion; i.e. the Eucharist is 'the Image of the Catholic Church'. The Eucharist is 'what the entire Catholic faith rests upon' and without the Eucharist, the false god 'Catholicism' would cease to exist. And so if 'the Eucharist is the Image of the Catholic Church', and 'the Catholic Church is the main Beast', then 'the Eucharist is the Image of the Beast'. The Eucharist - a false image of Jesus - is Satan's 'control symbol' or 'control image' which makes people bend their knees in submission to him while thinking that they are submitting to Jesus and God; it is basically a puppet Jesus from behind which Satan can speak his own laws that people *believe* are God's laws. The <u>conclusive evidence</u> indicating that 'the Image of the Beast is the Eucharist' is when the **second beast** (the Pope) is granted **authority** from the first Beast (the Catholic Church) to "breathe life into the Image of the (first) Beast". There is, and always has been, *only <u>one</u> institutional empire* that *the whole world follows* who <u>claims</u> that they can 'breathe life into an inanimate object or image'. That institution is the Catholic Church. They are the Beast, and they grant authority to the second beast (i.e., 'the false prophet' or the Pope) to breathe a false life (i.e., transubstantiation) into a false image of Jesus. Even if you believe in the Eucharistic miracles, in that bread has truly been transformed into the flesh of Jesus, it is still 'the dead flesh of Jesus' lacking the true breath of God's Spirit; it is NOT the Living Jesus. So while they claim that the Eucharist is <u>alive</u> - just as the priests did with many Old Testament idols such as Bel - it still <u>cannot</u> breathe, speak, or walk as the one true Living Jesus could breathe, speak, and walk (see Section 7). Thus the false prophet <u>breathes false life</u> into 'a false image of Jesus'. Again, Satan is "The great Dragon who deceives the whole world" (Revelation 12.9), and he does so by speaking lies from behind a false image of Jesus: the **Eucharist**, which is the Image of the Beast.

John says "The Image of the Beast should both speak and cause as many as would not worship the Image of the Beast to be killed". How many countless millions have been killed physically, spiritually, emotionally, and mentally because they would not worship the Image of the Beast; because they would not bow to the lies spoken by men from behind the Eucharist? How many false words has the Catholic Church 'put in the mouth of their puppet Jesus' to guarantee submission of the multitudes? How many man-made rules - i.e., 'no salvation outside Catholicism' - has the Catholic Church fabricated in the name of a false Jesus so that people are taught to fear 'them and their institution' (Isaiah 29.13), thinking that by doing so they are fearing God? How many lies have been spoken from behind the Eucharist in the interest of world domination and the control of nations (if not physical control, then spiritual control which ultimately controls the physical actions of men anyway)? Speaking from behind the Image of the Beast, the Catholic Church has broken the New Covenant on a continual basis, teaching us their lies, and consequently a false persona of Jesus and the one true God (which is the Beast). So even in today's world, the Eucharist still 'speaks', thereby creating and propagating a false persona of God, and thereby also creating a propagating the **underlying** (i.e., hidden or unseen) cause of worldwide 'spiritual, emotional, mental, and physical death'. And so it is still true in today's world that 'as many as will not worship the Eucharist will be killed'. I.e., in today's world, Catholics themselves suffer 'spiritual, emotional, and mental death' if they don't worship the Eucharist, while 'the supremacy and exclusion projected onto all other religions who do not worship the Eucharist' is at the root of

worldwide 'division, war, and hate'; or <u>physical death</u> in addition to 'spiritual, emotional, and mental death'. Thus the <u>whole world</u> - i.e. 'the people of <u>every religion</u>' or 'every tribe, people, tongue, and nation' - is held <u>captive</u> by 'the Beast and his image'.

The <u>multitudes</u> of people from <u>every religion</u> - <u>including</u> the Catholic hierarchy and all other religious leaders - have been unknowingly <u>enslaved</u> and held <u>captive</u> by 'the Beast and the Image of the Beast'. And so because <u>even</u> the leaders of our religions, the hidden kings, are unaware that they themselves are blind slaves to Satan's Beast, John says "He who <u>leads</u> into <u>captivity</u> shall <u>go</u> into <u>captivity</u>". This saying is indicative of any and all idolatry. If you create and follow a false god, then use it to enslave people, you yourself (and especially your descendants) will also become a slave to that false god. Our religious leaders today, in particular the Catholic hierarchy, have <u>no idea</u> 'what they are truly following'. They have enslaved countless generations to Satan's Beast, but - due to their blindness caused by 'pride in inherited lies' - are unaware that they themselves are <u>also</u> enslaved. Thus they are truly 'blind leaders of the blind' and cannot '<u>see</u>' that they are holding people <u>captive</u>, just as they cannot '<u>see</u>' that they themselves are held <u>captive</u> as well. Our religious leaders lead people into captivity and also go into <u>captivity themselves</u> because they are blind to the error that they have inherited from their forefathers. And so the <u>leaders</u> of <u>every</u> religion are blind to the fact that they are 'servants of the Beast', <u>unknowingly</u> enslaved and held <u>captive</u> by 'the Beast and the Image of the Beast'.

As already mentioned, Satan gets people to <u>unknowingly do his will</u> by speaking the words in Scripture and then <u>changing their intention</u> (Luke 4.9-11). I.e., Satan appears as Jesus <u>'the Lamb'</u>, yet speaks <u>defiled intentions</u> of Jesus' words, as he is <u>'the Dragon'</u>. The <u>second beast</u> (or false prophet), the one to whom authority was given 'to breathe life into the first Beast', <u>breathes false life</u> into the <u>Eucharist</u> by 'appearing as a lamb, yet speaking like a dragon', just as Satan. As this prophecy says '<u>the second beast had two horns like a lamb and spoke like a dragon'</u>. The <u>Pope</u> is the second beast and it is he who 'speaks like a dragon', because (with a **forked** or double tongue) he speaks <u>the same words as Jesus, the Lamb</u>, but gives those words <u>the intentions of Satan, the Dragon</u>. Specifically, the Pope and his predecessors have taken the <u>figurative words</u> of Jesus like 'flesh, blood, and body', and given them <u>literal meanings</u> (see Section 7) in order to secure <u>their own proprietary claim to transubstantiation</u>, which in turn <u>secures</u> their control of Jesus and <u>the control of nations</u>. And so by 'appearing as a lamb and speaking like a dragon', the Pope (or second beast) has enslaved and seized the multitudes <u>for</u> the Dragon.

'The number of the second beast' - or 'the mark of the first Beast' - that people receive on their right hand or on their forehead is a spiritual mark, not a physical mark. This mark identifies them in the spiritual realm by both angel and demon. 'A spiritual mark' was used in Ezekiel 9.2-6 to identify those who did not worship the false idols; they were to be spared. Conversely, the mark of the Beast identifies those who do worship the Image of the Beast. Ezekiel 9.2-6 says "One man (actually an angel) among them was clothed with linen and had a writer's inkhorn at his side. The Lord said to him, 'Go through the midst of the city and put a mark on the foreheads of the men who sigh and cry over all the abominations that are done within it. To the others, go after them through the city and kill. Utterly slay old and young men, maidens and little children and women, but do not come near anyone on whom is the mark. Begin at My sanctuary.' So they began with the elders who were before the temple." Notice that the idolatry

started in God's <u>sanctuary</u> with the <u>elders</u>. Jesus was always challenging the Chief Priests and the elders at the temple, and Jeremiah 7.2-30, as well as this prophecy of the Image of the Beast, both tell us not to believe those who speak blasphemy from the tabernacle (or sanctuary) of God. Additionally, in Daniel 11.31 it says that 'The Abomination of Desolation (the Eucharist) <u>defiles the sanctuary</u>'; remembering of course that 'the Abomination of Desolation = the Image of the Beast'. Thus it is the religious leaders from every religion, <u>speaking lies from God's sanctuary</u>, who are responsible for people (including themselves) <u>unknowingly</u> receiving the mark of the Beast; they are responsible for people unknowingly worshiping the Beast. Since the mark of the Beast is a spiritual mark, it can <u>only be seen by spiritual eyes</u>, <u>not physical eyes</u>. It is not a mark that can be taken away or <u>removed by any physical outward</u> means such as <u>water baptism</u> or <u>the applying of holy water and /or anointing oils</u>. The 'mark of the first Beast' or 'the <u>number</u> of the second beast' can <u>only be removed</u> by '<u>belief in</u> the true words and the true intentions of God'; which of course are only spoken by the one true Jesus.

To calculate 'the <u>number</u> of the second beast', <u>666</u>, you have to realize that <u>the second beast is a perfect counterfeit of the one true Jesus</u>. He speaks all the <u>same words</u> as Jesus, but gives <u>defiled meaning</u> and <u>intentions</u> to those words. Remember that the second beast or false prophet has 'lamb's horns but speaks like a dragon' or he appears to us as a lamb, using the words of Jesus 'the Lamb', but speaking the intentions of the <u>Dragon</u>. I.e., the <u>double</u> tongue of the second beast speaks on behalf of the Dragon, <u>exalting</u> Christ with <u>words</u>, while simultaneously <u>opposing</u> Christ with <u>intentions</u>; which is the very definition of an antichrist (see Section 4). And so the <u>double</u> tongue of the second beast uses the words of Christ to 'exalt himself <u>as</u> Christ' while simultaneously insisting that 'he is <u>not</u> Christ'. Thus the second beast uses his <u>double</u> tongue to make himself into 'a false Lamb' or 'a satanic <u>double</u> of Jesus'.

Thus the <u>key to calculating</u> 'the <u>number</u> of the second beast' is to know that '<u>the second beast is a DOUBLE of JESUS</u>'. And so if you '<u>double the number that represents Jesus</u>' it equals '<u>the number that represents Jesus</u>' it equals '<u>the number that represents Jesus</u>' it equals '<u>the number that represents Jesus</u>' is represented by 'the number 3'. There are '<u>three 3's'</u> involved with 'the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ'. Jesus was crucified in the <u>3</u>rd hour, there were <u>3</u> hours of darkness and then Jesus died, and Jesus was raised on the <u>3</u>rd day. **333 represents Jesus.** If you double **333 it equals** <u>666.</u> Or in equation format: <u>2 x 333 = 666</u>. So 666 is the number that represents 'Jesus' satanic double' (or 'the false Lamb'). And if <u>the Pope</u> 'dresses' himself with the words of the Lamb, yet <u>speaks the intentions</u> of the Dragon, then the Pope is appearing to us as '<u>a false Lamb'</u> or 'Jesus' satanic double'. Thus <u>the Pope's number is 666 and he is the second beast</u> (a.k.a. the false prophet). Besides, when you consider that 'Satan disguises himself as Jesus to us', it is <u>only fitting</u> that 'his highest ranking minister <u>also portrays himself</u> as Jesus to us'.

Additionally, it must be noted that, while the 'second beast' is representative of 'one single man who is installed into the office of the Papacy' - i.e., 'the lamb itself' = 'the office of the Papacy' - the '2 horns on the lamb' are representative of our present time, having actually 2 Popes in Rome: Pope Benedict and the Pope Francis. And these 2 men who represent 1 man most certainly speak blatant

double tongue contradictions when you consider that 'the tongues of both of these men combined into one office' equates to 'one double tongue, as of a dragon, of great magnitude', with Pope Benedict being highly CONSERVATIVE by opposing homosexuality, Catholics remarrying, remarried Catholics receiving the Eucharist, and sexual liberty in general, and Pope Francis being highly liberal by supporting (at least on the surface) these same issues. Therefore, the '2 horns on the lamb' point to our present day, having 2 Popes in Rome who, within one office (i.e., within 'one lamb' or 'one beast'), speak blatant contradictions just like Satan, the Dragon.

If Jesus is returning to 'strike all the nations with the sharp sword that proceeds from His mouth (i.e., His words)', does this not infer that the Catholic evil tenants - the supposed heirs to the knowledge of Christ - have led the entire world astray using His name (i.e., 'appearing as lambs, but speaking like dragons')? Does this not imply that they have <u>caused</u> - either <u>directly</u> or <u>indirectly</u> through their forefather's <u>seeds</u> of idolatry (i.e., the creation of the Image of the Beast) - the entire world, 'both small and great, rich and poor, free and slave', to unknowingly follow and worship the Beast, thereby receiving his mark? 'To receive the mark of the Beast' (or 'the number of the second beast') means 'to place your religion, or any religious ideology, as a false god before the one true God'. By doing so we are contributing to the agenda of Satan - the destruction of humanity through 'division, war, and hate' - which makes people of various religious backgrounds blindly fight, shun, ostracize, and kill one another, thinking that they are <u>defending God</u>, while actually defending Satan's false gods, our religions. This is <u>how it is **possible** for</u> the **entire world** to receive 'the mark of the Beast' or 'the number of the second beast': they **think** defending their religion (i.e., their false god) is in service to God, yet it is actually in service to Satan (John 16.2). And so Satan's ability to redefine right and wrong keeps the whole world enslaved to his Beast (John 16.8-11), and under cruel spiritual, emotional, and mental bondage; which of course controls our actions, thereby bringing the whole world under cruel physical bondage as well.

So due to humanity's cruel spiritual, emotional, mental, and physical bondage of the last 2000 years which is a product of the Catholic Forefather's idolatry with the creation of the Image of the Beast - God will send a **Great Tribulation** (Revelation 7.14) of various **plagues** (i.e., loathsome soars accompanied by darkness, pain, and death for worshipping false gods and false idols, as per **Revelation 9.20**), and **natural disasters** (i.e., **blood filled seas and rivers** from dead creatures and **hail and fire** from heaven). As Revelation 14.15 says, these plagues and disasters represent 'the harvest of God's vineyard' (or 'the gathering of the wheat') at the end of this current 'age of darkness'. And as a result of these plagues and disasters at 'harvest time', the Catholic Church (along with all other man-made religions, or false gods) will be **destroyed**. This of course is represented by 'the fall of Rome (Babylon)' and 'the casting of the two beasts into the lake of fire by Christ (the Rider on the white horse)' (Revelation chapters 18 and 19). When Christ returns He will 'strike the nations with the sharp two-edged sword that proceeds from His mouth' (Revelation 19.15 and Isaiah 11.4) thereby destroying the Catholic Church, the Papacy, and <u>all</u> of the <u>other hidden kings</u> of the earth who will gather (or <u>assemble</u>) to do battle with the Lamb at Armageddon (Revelation 16.14-16 and 19.19-21). Christ will then rule the nations Himself with 'a rod of iron' for 1000 years of peace; note that 1000 years may be symbolic for 'an indeterminate great length of time' as 'a day with God can equal 1000 years' (2 Peter 3.8). And so just as our human body will have violent reactions in order to remove and purge toxins that we have ingested in the past, Christ will return and there will be <u>violent reactions</u> (i.e., the **Great Tribulation**) in the 'whole <u>body</u> of people' (which of course is humanity) in order to <u>remove and purge the toxins</u> that our religious leaders have 'fed the body' for many thousands of years.

The **Great Tribulation** is 'the correction that brings about 1000 years of peace' and corresponds to 'the <u>Dawn'</u> of 'a new age of light' brought about by the <u>return</u> of Jesus, the Bright and <u>Morning Star</u> (Revelation 22.16). Upon Jesus' return, which also marks 'the <u>marriage</u> of Jesus to His bride (i.e., His people)' (Revelation 19.7), we will make <u>an exodus</u> from 'our current age of darkness' and pass into 'an age of light' that is marked by 'the true knowledge of Jesus' that describes 'the true nature and persona of God'. The Great Tribulation also represents the <u>final destruction of the temple</u>, as any and all temples represent 'man-made religion' or 'Satan's false gods'. In Matthew 24.2-3 Jesus says - concerning 'the time of the Great Tribulation, His 2nd coming, and the End of the Age' - 'Not one stone shall be left here (where the temple stands) upon another that shall not be thrown down'. Note that when John describes the New Jerusalem in Revelation 21.22, he <u>also</u> says "But I saw <u>no temple in it</u>, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb <u>are its temple</u>". We have no use for temples in the man-made sense because each person - having 'the kingdom of God within them' (Luke 17.21) - acts as 'a <u>living stone'</u> (1 Peter 2.5) that builds 'the living temple of the Living God and the Living Jesus'. Or "We are the temple of the Living God" (2 Cor.6.16). And so because man-made temples only represent our false gods that divide us and keep us at war, the Great Tribulation = the destruction of the temple = <u>peace</u>.

5.3 Prophesy of 'The End of the Age'

At the end of Matthew chapter 23 and for most of Matthew chapter 24, Jesus conveys to His disciples the events that will give rise to <u>His (Jesus') return</u> and <u>the destruction of **all** temples</u> at 'the End of the Age'.

This prophecy starts by Jesus telling the Teachers of the Law and the Pharisees that 'their house or 'way of life' (i.e., their inherited laws, customs, and traditions that 'use the word of God to make the word of God of no effect') has become one of desolation because they have rejected the message of the Prophets'. After this Jesus says 'You will not see Me again until My return. Jesus then leaves the temple (which represents their 'house') telling His disciples "Do you not see all these things? Assuredly, I say to you, <a href="mailto:not one stone shall be left here upon another, that shall not be thrown down." I.e., 'This and every temple will be <a href="mailto:destroyed upon My (Jesus') return at the End of the Age because people will continue to reject the message of the Prophets'.

Jesus' <u>disciples</u> then come to Him in private and ask Him 'when the temple will be destroyed' and 'what will be the signs that will show <u>Your 2nd coming</u> and <u>the End of the Age'</u>. Jesus then describes to His disciples the events that will take place leading up to 'the end'. He says "Take heed that <u>no one deceives you</u>. For <u>many will come in My name saying, 'I am the Christ'</u>, and will <u>deceive many</u>. You will hear of wars, as nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom. And there will be famines, pestilences, and earthquakes everywhere. All these are only the <u>beginning</u> of sorrows. Then <u>many false prophets will rise up and deceive many</u>. And because <u>lawlessness</u> (God's law, not man's law) will abound, the <u>love of many will grow cold</u>. But he who endures to <u>the end</u> shall be saved. And this <u>Good News of the kingdom will be preached in all the world</u> as a witness to <u>all the nations</u>, and <u>then the end (of this current 'age of darkness') will come</u>".

Jesus continues "Therefore when you see the Abomination of Desolation,", spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place (i.e., tabernacle or sanctuary), then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains. And let him who is in the field not go back to get his clothes. For then there will be Great Tribulation, such as has not been since the beginning of the world until this time, no, nor ever shall be. Then if anyone says to you, 'Look, here is the Christ!' or 'There!' Do not believe it. For false christs and false prophets will rise and show great signs and wonders to deceive, if possible, even the elect. See, I have told you beforehand. For as lightning comes from the east and flashes to the west, so also will the (2nd) coming of the Son of Man be."

"Immediately after the <u>tribulation</u> of those days the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light; <u>the stars (or angels)</u> will fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens will be shaken. Then the sign of the Son of Man will appear in heaven, and then <u>all the tribes of the earth will mourn</u> (see also Revelation 1.7) and they will see the Son of Man coming in <u>a cloud</u>

with power and great glory. Now when these things begin to happen, look up and lift your heads, because your redemption draws near (this line from Luke 21.28)." Jesus concludes by assuring us that 'This generation (note that 'generation' = 'age'; and this present age is the same age as when Jesus said these words) will by no means pass away till all these things take place. Heaven and earth will pass away, but My words (especially this prophecy) will by no means pass away.'

Commentary on the Prophecy of 'The End of the Age'

Jesus begins this prophecy with what is to be the final outcome of 'His 2nd coming' and 'the End of the Age': the destruction of the temple. Many people think that the destruction of the temple has already occurred; i.e., the Romans destroyed the temple in Jerusalem in 70 AD. But this prophecy clearly says 'when will the temple be destroyed thereby showing **Jesus'** 2nd coming and the End of the Age'. Since 'the return of Jesus' and 'the End of the Age' have yet to occur, then the destruction of the temple is also yet to occur. This present age (i.e., generation) is one of idolatry in which we - just as in Jesus' day, since we are all part of the same 'adulterous generation' - reject the message of the Prophets by worshipping false gods (or false personas of God). Religion itself, all of its rituals and ceremonies, acts as a false god before the one true God. And by deceptively renaming our false gods with the respective names of our religions, Satan has tricked us into unknowingly breaking God's Primary Commandment and the New Covenant. Jesus' message to the Jews was that 'the religion of <u>Judaism had become a false god</u> before the one true God'; just as our religions today are also false gods. Hence the Jewish temple in Jesus' day was **symbolic** of a false god, with the **temple** essentially *acting as* a false idol: an inanimate object or structure that triggered a set of false man-made beliefs. Thus, when Jesus says 'The temple will be destroyed at the End of the Age', then that translates to 'False gods represented by the names of our religions, and the false idols (i.e., temples) that house those false gods, will be destroyed at the End of the Age'. Or 'the destruction of the temple' = 'the destruction of religion'. Jesus recognized that organized religion is a mechanism used by Satan for supremacy (i.e., 'The Jews thought that they should receive salvation first') which ultimately leads to 'division, war, and hate'. Thus the only way to achieve true 'unity, peace, and love' is to destroy man-made religion (i.e., false gods and their idols); which is of course represented by 'the destruction of temple' at the End of the Age.

Jesus came to fulfill the message of the Prophets. Their message was that organized religion was **not** the work of God, but rather the work of 'man and Satan'. Jeremiah 7.22 reiterates this by saying "For I (God) did not speak to your fathers, or command them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices (or rituals and ceremonies)". Thus Jesus did not come to start a new religion of 'different and supposedly better' rituals and ceremonies (i.e., Catholicism), but to destroy religion; to 'destroy the temple'. The man-made religion of today is an insult to God; as if He can't see the true intentions and pride in the hearts of men. The leaders use religion for control and power, to separate and exclude, to judge and murder (indirectly of course), and to teach supremacy that divides us into warring mobs; all while using the name of God and claiming to stand for 'equality, unity, and peace'. Speaking about the religious leaders, Jesus quotes Isaiah by saying 'Hypocrites, it is no use for you to worship God because you teach man-made laws as if they were God's laws, thereby honoring God with your words while your hearts are far away' (Matthew 15.7-9). God knows the true intentions in the hearts of the religious leaders. Just like Herod in Matthew 2.8, they say 'I want to worship Jesus', but their true intentions should read 'I want to rule over and control Jesus so that I will gain the control, power, and respect that comes from being associated with Jesus'. The institution of the Eucharist is the Catholic hierarchy's way of saying 'I want to worship Jesus' while their true intentions (like Herod) say 'I want to rule over and own Jesus for control, power, and glory'. And the Catholic hierarchy, just like all of the religious leaders, rules over and controls Jesus from their power positions: their temples. Thus

the temple is symbolic of 'a religious leader's ability to exude spiritual, emotional, and mental domination over his fellow man'. The temple is symbolic of one man's ability to manipulate the mind of another man by using and exploiting the names of God and Jesus. The temple is a religious leader's way of deceptively exalting themselves above Christ without saying 'I exalt myself above Christ'. God wants to destroy the physical temples of this world because they only serve 'man and the kingdom of Satan', not 'the kingdom of God'. Jesus says in John 2.19-21" **Destroy this temple**, and in three days I will raise it up. But He was speaking of the temple of His body"; which is constructed of people (or 'living stones'), not actual stones as are used in the construction of a physical temple that has 4 walls and a roof. As 2 Corinthians 6.16 says "We are the temple of the Living God". Jesus' true temple is not a temple made with human hands (Acts 17.24) in the **physical realm** (i.e., <u>Jesus' true temple</u> is a **figurative** temple built with 'our spirits'), and every man-made physical temple on earth is a counterfeit of 'the living temple of the Living God and the Living Jesus'. 'The living temple of the Living God and the Living Jesus' can only be built by <u>us;</u> 'living stones' <u>not</u> 'actual stones'. Remember in Revelation 21.22 "(John) saw no temple, for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are its temple". So at 'the End of the Age', Jesus will return to destroy all of the physical temples that represent our false gods (our religions) because they are a defilement of the one true living temple; which is basically humanity itself.

The message of the Prophets was clear; the various sacrifices, ceremonies, and rituals associated with religion are 'of man and Satan', not God. All God wants is for us to simply 'Love one another' (John 13.34). All God wants is 'Kindness and mercy, not sacrifice' (Matthew 12.7). The 'sacrifices' in Matthew 12.7 are referring to the worthless man-made rituals (such as the Eucharist; a.k.a. the supposed 'Holy Sacrifice of the Mass') that only serve our division and separation; not the 'sacrifices' of simply helping one another. Hebrews 13.16 says "Do not forget to do good and help one another, these are the sacrifices that please God". Amos 5.21-24 says "I (God) hate, I despise your feast days, and I do not savor your sacred assemblies. Though you offer Me burnt offerings and your grain offerings, I will not accept them nor will I regard your fattened peace offerings. Take away from Me the noise of your songs, for I will not hear the melody of your stringed instruments. <u>But let justice run down like water and</u> righteousness like a mighty stream". God is telling us not to insult His intelligence with worthless words, song, sacrifices, and offerings of our religions, when we have ignored what is truly important to Him: justice and righteousness, which of course are obscured by the 'supremacy, exclusion, judgment, hate, prejudice, and division' of religion. Micah 6.6-8 repeats the same message as Amos. He says 'God does not want burnt offerings, thousands of rams, 10,000 rivers of oil, or your firstborn for your transgressions. The Lord <u>only requires</u> that you do <u>justly</u>, love <u>mercy</u>, and walk <u>humbly</u> with Him.' <u>True worship of God</u> involves simply 'loving one another, being kind and merciful, and upholding justice'; understanding of course that 'to love others is to love God'. Our religions, which consist of 'sacrifices, ceremonies, and rituals', represent the worship of Satan because they exalt man, while being disguised as something that exalts God. Thus, since the temple is 'the place' where we perform all of our religious sacrifices, ceremonies, and rituals - i.e., the temple is synonymous with the worshiping of our <u>false gods</u> that we call religions - all the temples of this world must be destroyed if <u>the true worship</u> of God is to be restored. Jesus makes it clear in this prophecy that His return at 'the End on this Age'

means '<u>the destruction of the temple</u>' - which in turn also means '<u>the end of religion</u>' (i.e., false gods) - so that the true worship of God, simply '<u>loving one another</u>', may be restored.

So when will Jesus return to destroy the temple and religion? In this prophecy we are given a rough timeline. 'Nations will fight each other, kingdoms will attack one another, and there will be many famines, pestilences, and earthquakes.' It should take at least a few hundred years for kingdoms to rise and fall, and for multiple famines, multiple pestilences, and multiple earthquakes to occur. And "All these are only the beginning of sorrows". So if a few hundred years is only the beginning, a few thousand years is not an unreasonable estimate for the Catholic evil tenants to rule over 'the vineyard' after killing and casting out Jesus, 'the Heir to the kingdom'. A few thousand years is not an unreasonable estimate for the world to live under the darkness of Catholicism. Thus Jesus was indicating in this prophecy that our present 'age of darkness' would last for a considerable amount of time. 2 Peter 3.8 says that 'with God, one day is a thousand years' and Ezekiel 4.4-6 says that '430 days symbolizes 430 years'. Considering that 'our sense of time' is not the same as 'God's sense of time', then the <u>timeline</u> in this prophecy of 'The End of the Age' easily coincides with the <u>timeline</u> in the prophecy of 'The Abomination of Desolation'. Recalling from Ezekiel 4.4-6 that 1 day = 1 year, Daniel 11.33&36 says "<u>Yet for many days</u> they (the people of understanding) shall fall by sword and flame, by captivity and plundering. The (Catholic evil tenants) shall prosper until the wrath (the Great Tribulation) has been accomplished". So again, 2000 years of oppression, falling by the sword and flame of the Catholic evil tenants, is by no means difficult to believe given 'the timeline written in these prophecies' and that 'our sense of time is **not** the same as God's sense of time'. But concerning the **exact time** of 'Jesus' return' and 'the destruction of the temple', Jesus Himself says "No one knows when that day and hour will come; the Father alone knows" (Matt 24.36).

Also, it is important to recognize that Jesus says 3 different times in this prophecy 'false christs and false prophets will deceive many using the name of Christ'. Since Muslims, Jews, Hindus, etc., do not 'claim to be Christ' as Catholic leaders do - not outwardly of course, but with a double tongue - then it is the Catholic hierarchy today and their forefathers that Jesus was prophesying about. They are the ones (i.e., antichrists) using Jesus' name to preach a false or Anti-Good News (see Section 12) that sounds like the true Good News. The Catholic leaders are the ones preaching a message of supremacy and exclusion -'there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church' - that they pretend is a message of equality and <u>inclusion</u>. Their false Good News is 'a message of division, war, and hate' <u>disquised</u> as 'a message of unity, peace, and love', making the Catholic hierarchy antichrists, or 'false christs', who use the name and words of Christ, but speak the intentions of Satan: who is 'the opposite persona of Christ' or 'the Antichrist'. Thus their false Good News is not the true Good News, and 'the nations' have never heard the true Good News. That is why Jesus said "This Good News of the kingdom will be preached in all the world as a witness to all the nations and then the end will come". When the true Christ returns at 'the End of the Age', it will become obvious as to the identity of the false christs (i.e., the antichrists) who have deceived the nations, with all of the nations finally hearing the true Good News of the New Covenant.

Defiling the name of Christ, the Catholic hierarchy has **obscured** the true Good News of the New Covenant that states 'God is our only Teacher and, if others teach us about God, then they are in

<u>violation</u> of the New Covenant'. The Catholic Church has obscured this because it would of course <u>contradict</u> the whole premise of their religion that states '<u>They</u> will teach us about God'. But their god (Catholicism) is one who demands - by their own man-made assertions - subservience to the leaders of Catholicism to ensure that those leaders (and ultimately Satan) maintain authority, control, and power over God's vineyard. Again the Catholic Good News is <u>not</u> the <u>true</u> Good News; it is the Anti-Good News and it is <u>exclusive</u> only to those who bow to their false idol (a.k.a. the Eucharist, the Abomination of Desolation, or the Image of the Beast). The true Good News of the New Covenant is that '<u>everyone</u> who simply loves their neighbor as themselves will be saved'. The true Good News <u>excludes no one</u>, is <u>all-inclusive</u>, and is <u>Universal</u>. Thus, at 'the <u>end</u> of this present age of darkness', the <u>true</u> Good News of the New Covenant - which has been obscured by the false christs of the false god 'Catholicism' - will be preached to all the nations.

At the same time the true Good News is 'preached to all the nations', it will be revealed 'by the **knowledge** of Christ' that 'the **Eucharist** is actually the Abomination of Desolation standing in the sanctuary of the Catholic Church' (see Section 5.1). I.e., the Eucharist is the false idol (or false image of Jesus) - that can be seen on the altar and in the tabernacle (or 'holy place') at any Mass - which is responsible for 2000 years of worldwide desolation. We must realize that Catholicism inherited all of its ideas of performing rituals from Judaism; i.e., Catholicism was just a continuation of Judaism, and is simply a new name for what Judaism was 2000 years ago. So since 'the Eucharist is consecrated on the altar and placed in the tabernacle in a Catholic Church' - which is the same as the holy place in Judaism then the Eucharist is most definitely 'the Abomination of Desolation standing in the holy place'. And so at the time when the true Good News is 'preached to all the nations', it will be revealed that 'the <u>Eucharist is our source of worldwide division, war, and hate</u>', and ultimately 'the Abomination' that has <u>caused</u> nearly 2000 years of 'Desolation'. Note that the Eucharist as the Abomination of Desolation is a false christ produced by false christs (the Catholic hierarchy) who say 'Look here is the Christ'. But Jesus has warned us 'beforehand' that 'false prophets and false christs would rise and perform great signs and wonders (i.e., the **Eucharistic Miracles**, see Section 8) to deceive **even** the elect'. The false christs of Catholicism have said 'Look here is the Christ', when the entire time it has actually been a false christ: 'the Abomination of Desolation'.

Jesus' words have been right in front of us for two millennia; hilden in plain sight by the darkness. He told us "My words will not pass away", yet somehow we have failed to heed His words. <a href="https://millennia.com/h

to all the nations'. This is what is meant by 'The Son of Man will come in <u>a cloud</u> with power and great glory'. 'The cloud' is another name for the internet; i.e., 'shared information or knowledge in a cloud'. So the internet is 'the cloud of power and great glory' that will relay the true knowledge of Christ at the time of His 2nd coming. I.e., the knowledge of Jesus Christ that reveals the Eucharist as being 'the Abomination of Desolation' and 'the source of division, war, and hate' will be transmitted over the internet; remembering of course that Christ is 'the sole Mediator of the New Covenant', or 'the One who transmits or brings about the truth of God'. The internet or 'the cloud' will allow us to "see the Abomination of Desolation that was spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place". And 'the cloud' will give us sight and power over the darkness which is cast by the shadow of Satan's Catholic Beast.

At the time that the Abomination of Desolation is 'seen', there will be 'a Great Tribulation such as has not been since the beginning of the world'. From Revelation chapter 16, the Great Tribulation will entail many plagues; 'loathsome soars, blood filled seas and rivers, darkness and pain, and great hailstones from heaven'. Matthew 24.29 says that "The sun will be darkened, the moon will not give its light; the stars will fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens will be shaken". Note that 'a star' in the Bible = an angel (see Revelation 1.20). 'Stars falling from heaven' refers to Satan and his angels being cast out of heaven (Revelation 12.9 and Isaiah 14.12). Everyone thinks of heaven as 'in the sky', but heaven is actually just 'the hidden or spiritual realm'. Jesus says in Luke 17.21 "The kingdom of God (heaven) is within you". This is where our spirit resides, 'hidden' in our flesh. 'Our flesh and this earth' is considered the physical realm that can be 'seen'. If 'Satan and his angels (i.e., stars) are struck and cast out of heaven to the earth' (Revelation 12.4&9), then this means that they (angels) will be 'removed from the hidden spiritual realm' and be manifested in the physical, earthly realm, so that we may see and hear them with our physical eyes and ears, and we will be able to identify them for the demons that they truly are. This idea of 'spirits coming out of the hidden or unseen realm, and into the seen realm' is noted in Luke 4.34. The evil spirits recognized 'who Jesus was' and were drawn out of their hiding place that was deep inside of the man's heart; i.e., people did not even know that the demons were living inside of them until the demon was threatened by Jesus' presence. In today's world, the evil spirits have portrayed themselves as 'normal' so that we cannot recognize them. But when Jesus returns, the evil spirits, being threatened by the presence of Christ, will confess 'who He is' out of fear, and they will be manifested in the physical realm; or 'the stars will fall from heaven to the earth'.

Once the Abomination of Desolation is 'seen' and the true Good News is preached to the entire world, 'the destruction of the temple and religion' (i.e., the Great Tribulation) will usher in a new age. This 'present age of darkness' will end and 'a new age of light and worldwide peace' will begin; remembering of course that 'Jesus is the Light and the Morning Star', and 'His return' represents 'the Dawn' of 'a new age of light'. Most people - because of the seeds that Satan has planted in all of our minds from the earliest ages of life - cannot fathom that Jesus' return will bring about 'the destruction of churches, mosques, synagogues, and temples'. But 'the destruction of the temple' is in essence 'the destruction of all of Satan's false gods' which keep the world divided, and make peace impossible. 'The destruction of the temple' has been God's plan from the beginning of time, and Jesus announced that

plan to the world 2000 years ago. We must remember that 'Jesus' words will by no means pass away', hence 'the destruction of the temple' is inevitable to attain worldwide peace.

6. Prophecies from 'The Revelation of Peter'

In 1945 Christian Scripture from the years 150 AD to 300 AD was discovered (and rejected by the Catholic Church as heresy) in Nag Hammadi, Egypt. Among them were Gospels of Philip, Thomas, and Mary Magdalene, as well as a book entitled 'The Revelation of Peter'. In the year 367, Bishop Athanasius declared these writings to be heretical and ordered them to be destroyed. Hence they did not make the list of acceptable writings that we consider the New Testament. These unacceptable writings, 'the Nag Hammadi Scriptures', were never destroyed, but rather buried in a clay jar for safe keeping only to be unearthed 1500 years in the future. While some of the Nag Hammadi Scriptures may be of questionable authenticity, 'The Revelation of Peter' appears to be authentic since it coincides with much of the same tone as 'Peter, Paul, John, Jude, and Jesus' of the New Testament writings. That 'tone' of course being 'for us to beware of false teachers and false apostles who teach false doctrine and a false persona of Christ'. Also adding to the authenticity of the Revelation of Peter are parallels between it and the New Testament such as: A) the mention of 'dry canals', which is also mentioned as 'dried up springs' in 2 Peter 2.17, B) the mention of 'the brotherhood', which is also mentioned in 1 Peter 5.9 and 1 Peter 2.17, and C) the mention of verses that closely parallel Matthew 23.13 and 13.12.

The Revelation of Peter was probably destroyed because it makes specific mention of corrupted successors of Peter (i.e., the Catholic Pope), as well as specific mention of corrupted (Catholic) bishops (such as Athanasius himself), priests, and deacons who "bow before the judgment of the leaders"; thus making them 'false teachers and false apostles'. Additionally, the Revelation of Peter supports many of the same themes mentioned in the three previous prophecies. It speaks of false prophets, namely the Catholic hierarchy, who use the name of Christ, yet are 'blind and deaf' because they unknowing use Christ's name to cause division and desolation. They follow 'a false persona of Jesus', and therefore deceive many with complicated man-made doctrines. And these false prophets will rule over and oppress others for "a time proportionate to their error"; and great error equates to a great length of time. But after that period of time, Jesus will return to "pull out their error by its root"; and the root of Catholicism's error is of course the Eucharist. Below is a summary of 'The Revelation of Peter' found in the Nag Hammadi Scriptures.

Jesus says to Peter "Put your hands to your ears and listen to what the priests and the people are saying. I (Peter) listened to the priests as they were sitting with the scholars, and the multitude was shouting with a loud voice. Jesus said, listen again to what they are saying. I (Peter) listened again. They are praising You, Jesus, as You are sitting here. Jesus then replied, I have told you that these people are blind and deaf. Now listen to the things I'm telling you in secret and keep them. Do not tell them to the children of this age. For they will denounce you during these ages, since they are ignorant of you, but they will praise you when there is knowledge."

Jesus then says "At first many will accept our words, but they will turn away according to the will of the father of their error (Satan). Those who have associated with people of error will become their prisoners. But (other) good people will be handed over to the dealer in death, in the kingdom of those who praise a Christ (i.e., 'a false persona of Christ' or 'the persona of the

Antichrist') of a future restored world. They will also praise people who preach this falsehood, people who will come after you (Peter). They will hold on to the name of a dead Man, thinking that in this way they will become pure, but instead they will become more and more defiled. They will fall into 'a name of error' and into the hand of an evil deceiver with complicated doctrines, and they will be dominated by heresy as some of them will blaspheme the truth and proclaim evil teachings."

Jesus continues "Others will wander due to evil words and <u>mysteries</u> that lead people astray.

People who <u>do not understand</u> the mysteries, and <u>speak of what they don't understand</u>, will <u>boast that the mystery of truth is there's alone</u>. In <u>arrogance they will embrace <u>pride</u> and will <u>envy the immortal Soul (Jesus)</u> that has been used as a down payment. For <u>every authority</u> <u>and principality wants to be with the immortal souls</u> in the created world, in order that these <u>authorities</u> and <u>principalities may be glorified</u> by the immortal souls. These <u>authorities and</u> <u>principalities have NOT been saved or shown the way</u> by the immortal souls."</u>

"Many others, who oppose the truth and are messengers of error, will ordain their error and their law against My pure thoughts. They do business in My word. And they will establish a harsh fate for this generation... until My (Jesus') return. Some will create a mere imitation of the remnant (of the brotherhood of incorruptible spiritual fellowship) in order that the little ones (i.e., blind and otherwise innocent followers of the blind leaders) may not believe in the light that is. These are the workers who will be cast into the outer darkness. For they will not enter, nor do they allow those who are going to their destination, for their deliverance, to enter (see Matthew 23.13 and Luke 11.52). (And so) what will appear is a mere imitation (of the brotherhood) called the sisterhood. These people (the sisterhood) will oppress their brothers and say to them, 'Through this fellowship our God has mercy, since salvation comes to us alone through this fellowship'. They do not know the punishment of those who watched and rejoiced when the little ones were taken captive. And there are others outside the brotherhood who call themselves bishops and deacons, as if they have received authority from God, but they bow before the judgment of the leaders. These people are dry canals."

Peter replies to Jesus, "There are <u>many phonies</u> (i.e., <u>false prophets</u>) who lead astray and <u>subdue multitudes of living ones</u>. And <u>when they speak Your name (Jesus)</u>, <u>people will believe them</u>". Jesus responds, "<u>For a specified time proportionate to their error, they will rule</u> over the little ones. <u>After the completion of error</u>, 'the Being of immortal understanding' (i.e., Jesus) will become new, and the <u>little ones will rule over their rulers</u>. That Being will <u>pull out their error by its root</u>, and <u>put it to shame and expose it for all the liberties it has taken</u>. Be strong, for these mysteries have been given to you (Peter) so that you might know clearly that the <u>One they crucified is the firstborn</u>, and the <u>abode of demons</u>." Jesus completes His message by saying to Peter "<u>You are to present what you have seen to those who are strangers</u>, who are not of this age".

Commentary on the Prophecies from 'The Revelation of Peter'

The Revelation of Peter opens with Jesus trying to convey to Peter that multitudes of people, led of course by the priests and biblical scholars, will praise Jesus in name, but in doing so, they will ultimately practice 'supremacy and exclusion - in the name of Christ - that gives rise to war and division'; which is the <u>antithesis</u> of Jesus' message of 'equality and inclusion that gives rise to peace and unity'. And it is important to realize that, if this multitude of people is 'shouting and praising the name of Christ', then they must be people who we consider to be **Christians**. So what makes these Christians 'blind and deaf' to the fact that they are unknowingly following Satan, the Antichrist? What makes these Christians, who are supposed followers of Christ, actually antichrists? Remember that pride, vanity, and envy of God's supremacy is the root of spiritual blindness; which is understood to be spiritual deafness as well. Since the *proud* and *vain* religious <u>leaders</u> envy the authority, supremacy, and glory that is associated with the names of Christ and God, they monopolize those names in order to secure control and power over the people. Therefore, due to their pride and vanity, the religious leaders become 'blind and deaf', and in turn create multitudes of 'blind and deaf followers'. As Jesus says, 'They are blind leaders, leading the blind multitudes into hell' (Matthew 15.14). The pride and vanity of the Christian religious leaders makes them oblivious to the fact that they teach 'supremacy, judgment, and condemnation of others in the name of Christ', therefore blindly leading the entire multitude of Christians into blindly opposing Christ, while believing that they are honoring Christ. I.e., the entire multitude stays 'blind and deaf' to the fact that 'they honor Jesus and God with their words, while their hearts are far away' (Matthew 15.8). The entire multitude stays 'blind and deaf' to the fact that they honor and glorify their own man-made doctrine (which they think is the doctrine of Christ), thereby unknowingly honoring and glorifying man (i.e., themselves) and Satan, while believing that they are honoring and glorifying Jesus and God. And the entire multitude stays 'blind and deaf' to the fact that they unknowingly create 'division, war, and hate', while believing that they are promoting 'unity, peace, and love'. And so Jesus Himself is stating at the beginning of this prophecy - just as He does in Matthew 7.21-23 - that multitudes of people who 'shout and praise His name' and profess to be Christians, really do not know the true Christ, and are therefore tricked by Satan (the Antichrist) into becoming unknowing antichrists.

Jesus goes on to say that, because they will be led astray in error by Satan and his 'ministers of error', 'the people of this age' - which is still this current 'age of darkness and ignorance' - will not accept His message and sole purpose: to abolish religion, not to start of a new supreme and exclusive religion as was begun with Catholicism. These 'ministers' or 'people of error' - referring to the Catholic Forefathers and their descendents - will imprison the multitudes by making them praise and worship a false persona of Christ (i.e., 'the falsehood'); which Jesus articulates is actually the praising and worshiping of 'the ones who preach that false persona of Christ', the Catholic Forefathers and the present day leaders of Christianity. Jesus even recognizes that 'the people who preach this false persona of Christ in the future' are 'people who will succeed Peter'. Since the Pope of the Catholic Church is the self-proclaimed 'successor of Peter' or 'one who comes after Peter', then it is the Catholic Pope, his hierarchy, and all other Christian leaders that are rooted in Catholicism, who are specifically named as 'the people of

error who <u>imprison</u> the multitudes with a false persona of Christ'. And thus making it <u>obvious</u> why the Revelation of Peter was thrown out as **supposed heresy** by the Catholic Church in the year 367 AD.

Realizing that those who speak falsely on behalf of Christ create 'a false persona of Christ', Peter says toward the end of this prophecy, 'Many false prophets will lead the multitudes astray in error because people will <u>believe</u> them when they <u>speak the **name** of Christ</u>'. 'The creation of a false persona of Christ by people who speak falsely in the name of Christ' is also the essence of what Jesus is conveying when He says 'People will become more and more <u>defiled</u> by holding on to <u>the **name** of a dead Man</u>', and 'the One they crucified is the abode of demons'. The name of Jesus has been an 'abode' or 'safe dwelling place' for demons since the death of Christ. And so demons, namely Satan, hide themselves behind the name of a dead Man, thereby deceiving Christian leaders into speaking falsely on behalf of Jesus in order to get them to unknowingly oppose Christ's teaching, thinking that they uphold Christ's teaching. I.e., Christian leaders, and consequently all of Christianity, are tricked into 'unknowingly becoming more and more **defiled**, while **thinking** that they are becoming more and more **pure**'. By hiding behind the name of a dead Man, Satan and his angels have tricked and deceived Christianity (namely Catholicism) into 'speaking the name of Christ in vain', thereby instituting man-made commandments (i.e., 'complicated doctrine, heresy, and evil teachings') that directly violate God's Commandments. I.e., Satan, in hiding behind the name of Christ, suggested to the Catholic Forefathers that they violate the 2nd Commandment and New Covenant - and justify that violation by speaking it 'in the name of Christ' - in order to institute man-made commandments dictating that - under the threat of eternal damnation - we bow down to and serve 'their false persona of Jesus', 'Catholicism', and 'their false image of Jesus', 'the Eucharist'; which in essence is the same as bowing down to and serving 'a composite persona of the Catholic Forefathers' and 'an image that represents that persona'. And so as Peter predicted, 'people believed the Catholic Forefathers when they spoke falsely on behalf of Jesus', and humanity has been bore the consequences of their idolatry for nearly 2000 years. Thus, we must realize that, by us regarding the name of Christ as holy, it also makes the name of Christ the best and safest hiding place or 'abode' for Satan and his angels. We must realize that, While Christ Himself Was holy, His name has been used for 'everything and anything that is unholy', and so we have been utterly deceived by the name of Christ.

Through the simple use of the name and words of Jesus, Satan and his blind ministers of error (i.e., Christian leaders) have easily instituted 'mysteries that lead people astray'. As Jesus says 'Satan's ministers do business in My word'; remembering of course that 'Satan does business as Jesus' or 'Satan dba Jesus'. By 'doing business in the word of Christ', the Catholic Forefathers justified a mysterious occurrence - i.e., transubstantiation - in which they alone claimed to possess the unique ability to transform 'bread and wine' into 'the flesh and blood of Christ', thereby creating the Eucharist. By using the name and words of Christ, and then changing their intentions, the Catholic Forefathers 'led people astray with the Eucharist', claiming that it was 'a divine mystery' sent by God and instituted by Jesus. They claimed that the transubstantiation of the Eucharist constitutes 'a mystery of faith'; thereby taking advantage of people's desire to have faith in God, and confusing people by teaching them that 'faith in man's ability' is the same as 'faith in God's ability'. Remember that Satan, out of pride and

vanity, envies the <u>power</u> and <u>abilities</u> of God. And so likewise, Satan's ministers, the Catholic hierarchy, also <u>envy</u> the <u>power</u> and <u>abilities</u> of Jesus. They want us to believe that they, like Jesus, are capable of performing miracles. But the fact is, they <u>can't perform miracles</u>, so they disguise their pride, vanity, and envy - which is <u>a product of their inabilities</u> - as 'a <u>supposed mystery of faith</u>', saying 'If you don't have faith in our man-made mystery and supposed abilities, <u>then you don't have faith in God and His abilities</u>'. Thus, the only thing <u>mysterious</u> about the Eucharist - and other so-called mysteries and miracles of Catholicism concerning healing, forgiveness, and salvation - is the <u>wickedness</u> that lies behind them. Because of our <u>ignorance</u> of the true intentions and persona of Christ, the Catholic Church has 'led us astray', disguising man-made <u>fables and folklore</u> as 'divine mysteries of faith'. And they have '<u>boasted</u> of their mysteries', which are <u>exclusive</u> to them, in order to secure <u>control and power</u> over multitudes of people.

The mysterious wickedness, which is hiding behind 'the divine mysteries of Catholicism', is based on ignorance of the true knowledge of Christ; this is why Jesus says that 'they speak of what they don't understand'. The Catholic hierarchy is ignorant of the true knowledge of Christ, and Satan has corrupted them with his evil and wickedness, telling them that, if they don't understand his double thoughts, then it is because 'it's a mystery'. The Catholic hierarchy, and subsequently their followers, thinks that if they do not question the Eucharist and 'keep it mysterious', then they will have attained faith. But what they have attained is ignorance, not faith. We must realize that Satan institutes his evil and keeps people enslaved by 'keeping them ignorant of the truth'. Satan tricks people into throwing away all of their God-given logic and reason, saying, 'Throwing away the logic and reason that God gave you is what it means to have faith in God'. This is double minded; i.e., you should use the knowledge that God wrote on your heart to find the truth (yes), but don't use the knowledge that God wrote on your heart to find the truth (no). And so this 'ignorance that is disquised as faith' is essentially 'blind faith'. Therefore, 'blind faith is not faith at all', but just plain ignorance. And to have blind faith in 'the supposed divine mysteries of Catholicism' is not faith, but the ignorance that Satan thrives on. Philip says, 'Ignorance is the mother of all evil and it is slavery, while knowledge of the truth is freedom' (Philip 83,30-84,14). And as Jesus says, 'If you know the truth, the truth will set you free' (John 8.32). Thus, the truth is that 'the mysteries of the Catholic faith pertaining to transubstantiation, forgiveness, salvation, etc.', are a product of the Catholic Forefather's pride, vanity, and subsequent blind ignorance (i.e., nakedness); they are not rooted in 'the true knowledge of Christ'. And so since 'ignorance = slavery', and 'knowledge = freedom', their mysteries based on man-made ignorance are slavery, **not** freedom. As Jesus says, 'The principality of Catholicism, as much as they want to be with the immortal souls in the created world, are <u>ignorant of</u> and are <u>in opposition to the truth</u> (due to their **pride** and arrogance), and so have not been saved or shown the way by the immortal souls'.

Although <u>many religions</u> claim that there is 'no salvation outside their religion', it is <u>Catholicism</u> that is the religion which tries to <u>claim</u> that 'they are the <u>true successors</u> of Christ and His Apostles', and hence there is 'no salvation outside Catholicism'. But Jesus tells us in this prophecy that 'an <u>imitation</u> of Christ and His Apostles' (called 'the sisterhood') will appear claiming that 'there is <u>no salvation</u> outside their fellowship'. 'Christ, His Apostles, and other followers' were referred to as 'the brotherhood'; as 1 Peter

2.17 says, "Love the brotherhood". Catholicism (and consequently all religions derived from the seeds of Catholic error) is the imitation of 'the brotherhood', referred to here as 'the sisterhood'. Note that Jesus specifically mentions the titles of 'bishop and deacon' - which are titles synonymous with Catholicism and that these 'bishops and deacons' oppose 'the brotherhood', claiming to have received authority from God, when their authority is actually granted by Satan, the current ruler of this world. Therefore, these 'bishops and deacons' are described here as being part of 'the sisterhood', which facilitates the identifying of Catholicism as 'the sisterhood'. 'The sisterhood' claims that 'through their fellowship alone people will receive salvation'. But again this <u>supremacy</u> and <u>exclusion</u> is the total antithesis of Jesus' message. Think about it, Jesus acknowledges that the Jews believed in 'the supremacy and exclusion of their religion' (John 4.22), and told multiple parables about this supremacy and exclusion; i.e., the parables of 'The Laborers in the Vineyard' and 'The Prodigal Son'. Therefore, to even think that 'the true brotherhood' believed in 'no salvation outside the brotherhood' does not make any sense when Jesus continually preached against such supremacy and exclusion. So it is 'the sisterhood of the Catholic Church' that is the <u>imitation</u> of 'the brotherhood'. The Catholic Church is basically 'the <u>anti-brotherhood</u>' that teaches the supremacy and exclusion of their fellowship (i.e., their false god). As John says, the antichrists looked and sounded like the true Apostles. So too does 'the anti-brotherhood' look and sound like 'the true brotherhood'. But since 'the anti-brotherhood', for their own authority, glory, and supremacy, <u>defiles</u> the name and words of Christ with the <u>intentions</u> and <u>interpretations</u> of Satan, they are <u>antichrists</u> who directly oppose the very essence of 'the true brotherhood'. They are antichrists who, as Paul says, are 'False brethren who were secretly brought in to enslave the true brotherhood' (Galatians 2.4). Thus, the Catholic Church is 'the sisterhood' - a false brotherhood - and they have oppressed the multitudes for almost 2000 years by pretending to be 'the true brotherhood', and claiming that 'there is no salvation outside their fellowship'. As Jesus says, 'These workers (i.e., the hierarchy of the Catholic sisterhood) will be cast into the outer darkness for disquising 'Satan's darkness as light' and 'Jesus' light as darkness', and thereby imprisoning the little ones in sin'. I.e., the Catholic leaders, by redefining light and darkness, cause the unknowing multitudes to sin, thereby 'hindering the salvation of the multitudes', and simultaneously bringing about their own damnation. Again, Catholicism is 'a false brotherhood'; an imitation of 'the true brotherhood of Christ and His Apostles'. Their lust to be supreme like God (i.e., their proud envy of the immortal Soul of Christ) has made them blind and ignorant to the fact that 'their fellowship has not been saved or shown the way to salvation'. And while they think that they are 'honoring Christ', they are actually 'opposing Christ' as antichrists, thereby hindering 'the little ones' from finding their way to salvation.

But 'after a time proportionate to the Catholic sisterhood's <u>error</u>' - which equates to <u>a great length of time</u>, such as 2000 years, for <u>a great error</u> - Jesus, 'the Being of immortal understanding', will <u>return</u> (i.e., 'become new') to <u>destroy</u> and <u>abolish religion</u>; starting with Catholicism. As this prophecy says, 'Jesus will return and <u>pull out Catholicism's error by its root</u> and expose them (and all other religious leaders) for <u>the liberties</u> - i.e., <u>the acts of extortion</u> in the names of Jesus and God - that they have taken'. The <u>root</u> of Catholicism's error is '<u>the false image of Jesus</u>' from <u>behind</u> which the Catholic hierarchy has '<u>spoken lies</u> that have caused nearly 2000 years of senseless <u>death</u> and <u>desolation</u>'. That 'false image of Jesus', and <u>the root</u> of Catholicism's error, is of course <u>the Eucharist</u>: the false idol that

Catholicism has used to **deceive** the whole world. And the Eucharist - i.e., 'the Abomination of Desolation' and 'the Image of the Beast' - <u>still speaks</u> to this day, causing <u>worldwide</u> 'spiritual, emotional, mental, and physical' death and desolation. Thus the Eucharist is 'the root' or '<u>source of</u> <u>worldwide division, war, and hate</u>' that Jesus will '<u>rip out'</u> and '<u>set fire to</u>' upon His return.

The false knowledge (i.e., ignorance) that the Catholic Forefathers and hierarchy have concocted with their twisted tongues - their 'complicated doctrine (i.e., the Catholic catechism), heresy, and evil teachings' - is responsible for this 'present age of darkness and ignorance'. When Jesus returns - i.e., 'the Dawn' - we will enter 'a <u>new age</u> of light and knowledge'. This is why Jesus tells Peter that 'this revelation will be kept secret' and will be 'presented to and praised by strangers of a future age of knowledge'. That 'age of knowledge' is about to begin. But to enter into this 'age of knowledge and light' - which of course brings about worldwide peace - we must recognize that our 'supposed knowledge' of the true personas of Jesus and God, which are based on seeds of Catholic error, is actually <u>false knowledge</u>; is ignorance. And Catholicism <u>enslaves the entire world</u> to their *inherited ignorance*. Again, ignorance = slavery and knowledge = freedom. To be truly free and to realize world peace, we must no longer allow the Catholic hierarchy to keep us ignorant of 'the true knowledge of Christ'. We must no longer allow them to 'spoon feed' us their version of knowledge which keeps us in complacent ignorance and complacent slavery to their will; which is ultimately the will of Satan. This prophecy says "They will not enter, nor do they allow those who are going to their destination, for their deliverance, to enter". The parallel quote in Luke 11.52 says, "How terrible for you Teachers of the Law! For you have taken away the key of knowledge. You did not enter in yourselves, and those who were entering in you hindered." The Catholic Forefathers and present day leaders of our religions are the descendents of those of same Teachers of the Law. They replace 'the key of the knowledge of Christ' with 'their own man-made key of ignorance' in order that they may, for their own glory, control and enslave God's people, and consequently hinder their salvation. We will not enter into 'the new age of knowledge and light' (i.e., into deliverance) until we take back the key of knowledge that the Catholic Forefathers **stole** and **distorted** nearly 2000 years ago.

7. Flesh is the Word of Jesus, Blood is the Holy Spirit

Knowing that 'the most effective lies are the ones closest to the truth', Satan attaches his lies to the truth like a parasite, making 'God's truth and Satan's lies' appear to be one in the same. If we all believe that Scripture, for the most part, is God's truth - knowing that there are still clear discrepancies in Scripture, as noted in Jeremiah 7.22 and by Jesus Himself in Matthew 5.33-34 and 5.38-39 - then that is of course where Satan will hide and create his clever lies. Therefore, Satan's most effective means of tricking people is to 'cite Scripture and change its intention'; or to make up false interpretations of Scripture so that 'his lies appear to be one in the same with the truth'. Satan tells the best lies and deceives the greatest number of people by placing his lies (false interpretations) side-by-side with the truth (Scripture); or 'so close to the truth that you think it's the truth'. I.e., the interpretations of Scripture are where Satan plants his seeds of error that produce 'tares' that look like 'wheat'. And so by changing the intentions and interpretations of Scripture, Satan is essentially able to impersonate Jesus and/or God in our minds, thereby tricking the multitudes into unknowingly following him as if they are following Jesus and/or God.

By <u>impersonating God</u> - 'stealing the name and the word of God and thus changing His intentions' - Satan is able to accomplish his <u>main objective</u>: to have <u>God's people divided</u> so that 'we hate, kill, and destroy each other for no reason at all'. By impersonating God to the Catholic Forefathers, Satan was able to plant - next to Jesus' truth - his seeds of error that have led to the 'division, war, and hate' that we see among religions today. Satan was able to institute false man-made doctrine that was <u>disguised as</u> Jesus' (and consequently God's) doctrine. Thus, today's Catholic hierarchy (and consequently all other religious leaders) is unknowingly doing Satan's will by believing - and <u>teaching</u> - the <u>false</u> interpretations of Scripture handed down to them by their Catholic Forefathers. As Jeremiah 16.19 says "Surely our fathers have <u>inherited lies</u>". And by unknowingly doing Satan's will, the Catholic Church has made itself the largest and most effective <u>puppet</u> that Satan has ever created; it truly embodies the essence of 'the Beast of Revelation'. <u>Satan has tricked the Catholic hierarchy into falsely interpreting Scripture in order to serve his hidden purpose of worldwide division and the destruction of humanity.</u> And of course Satan easily tricked the Catholic hierarchy by <u>impersonating</u> Jesus and God, and thus offering them 'false power and authority in the names of Jesus and God' that was never actually granted by Jesus or God.

Satan's temptations are all related to power and authority; to being 'supreme like God' (Genesis 3.5). And so just as Jesus (in the 3rd temptation in the desert) was tempted with power and authority, so too has the Catholic hierarchy been tempted. In 'the 2nd temptation in the desert', Satan - essentially 'stealing God's identity' - disguised himself as God before Jesus, and then falsely interpreted Scripture in an effort to trick Jesus into unknowingly doing his (Satan's) will. While Jesus passed Satan's testing in the desert, the early Catholic Church failed the same identical test. Satan, disguised as Jesus and/or God to the Catholic Forefathers, said 'Bow to me by believing my false interpretations of words like 'flesh, blood, and body', and I will give you power and authority over all nations' (Matthew 4.9). And so the Catholic Forefathers, in their lust to be 'supreme like God' and rule over nations, believed Satan's misinterpretations, thereby being easily tricked into creating the Eucharist - 'a false image of Jesus' -

from **behind** which they (and ultimately Satan) could speak falsely on behalf of Jesus and God. Hence the Eucharist is the Catholic hierarchy's means by which they 'control Jesus', and thereby also 'control nations'; i.e., the <u>Eucharist</u> is 'the Catholic Church's <u>control symbol</u> and their source of power and <u>authority</u>'. But it is <u>false authority</u> and Satan is merely using them as his <u>puppet</u> to maintain <u>division</u>. And so Satan has caught the Catholic hierarchy in his *clever lie* by placing it right next to the truth. The truth is that Jesus did use words like 'flesh, blood, and body', but the lie is that these words have literal meaning. In believing Satan's misinterpretations of Scripture - their literal meaning - the Catholic hierarchy believes that they actually have the power and authority to transform (i.e., transubstantiation) 'bread and wine' into 'the flesh and blood of Christ'; which they claim also contains Christ's spirit. But they do not have this power and authority, and they have failed their temptation by believing Satan's cunning lies. Is it not highly coincidental that Satan also tempted Jesus into transforming a stone into bread? But Jesus replies to Satan that 'His Spirit does not subsist on physical bread, but on every **word** that proceeds from the mouth of God' (Matthew 4.4); the word of God being spiritual bread that brings eternal life (John 6.63). So why does the Catholic Church say that 'they live on <u>flesh</u>' (or <u>physical</u> bread) when Jesus Himself says to 'live on <u>words</u>' (or <u>spiritual</u> bread)? Why does the Catholic Church say that 'they live on the supposed flesh of Christ', when Jesus Himself says 'My flesh will profit nothing' (John 6.63). Thus, the Catholic interpretation of words such as 'flesh, **blood, and body'** is nothing more than a clever lie from Satan that has trapped the Catholic hierarchy and made them - and consequently all who blindly follow - Satan's unknowing slaves.

It is staggering to think that the false interpretations of the Catholic hierarchy - their 'lies so close to the truth that they appear to be the truth' - have survived for nearly 2000 years. In fact, when you examine their false interpretations closely, you'll find out that they are quite **blatant** and taken **out of context**. But since their lies have 'the words of Scripture' and 'the names of Jesus and God' attached to them they are close to the truth - no one questions them (that is 'the lies'); proving how serious it is to break God's Primary Commandment, as even 'bad lies become good lies' when they are spoken with the perceived fear of God backing them up. Therefore no one challenges the Catholic hierarchy out of fear that 'challenging them is the same as challenging Jesus and God'. And by 'sidling up' right next to the truth, and projecting unrighteous man-made fear (disguised of course as 'the fear of God') on the entire world, no one can tell the difference between 'fear of Catholic (man's) law' and 'fear of God's law'. Their 'laws based on lies' stand side-by-side with God's laws of truth, and we are not sure 'which is which'. Hence Catholicism itself (their 'set of false man-made laws and beliefs') is a false god that stands side-by-side with the one true God, and we can't tell 'which is which'. So just as in 'The Parable of the Wheat and the Tares', 'Catholicism and all of its lies' (the tares) have grown up unnoticed for nearly 2000 years side-by-side with 'God and the truth of Christ' (the wheat). But the time has come to identify 'which is which'. The harvest time at the End of the Age has come, when Jesus will return to 'sort the wheat from the tares'. The time has come to rip out and set fire to the lies and error of Catholicism. We must recognize that from the earliest ages of life, Catholicism has negotiated their position in our minds. Just as Satan sowed his seeds that produced the tares, the seeds of Catholic error have been planted in our minds and <u>allowed to grow</u>, producing <u>lies</u> about the <u>true intentions</u> and the <u>true</u> personas of Jesus and God. We must realize that Catholicism has been the 'sole proprietor' of the

<u>identities</u> of Jesus and God for almost 2000 years; *controlling* and *warping* Their personas with purposeful misinterpretations that satisfy their hidden agenda of world domination. Therefore we must 'unlearn what we have learned from the Catholic Church'. Everyone on earth must <u>unlearn</u> what Catholicism has taught them regarding the **personas** of both Jesus and God. Everyone must 'unlearn what they <u>thought they knew</u> about Jesus, and consequently God'. And to do this we must identify Catholicism's <u>blatant misinterpretations</u> of the words of Christ, and then <u>rip them out</u> and set fire to them.

John 6.54 says "Whoever eats My flesh and drinks My blood has eternal life". Realizing that the Jews (from the time of Moses and the Israelites) were quite familiar with 'literally **eating the flesh** of a literal, unblemished, firstborn **Passover lamb** in order to retain physical life' (see Exodus 12.8), Jesus spoke these words in John 6.54 to draw the **parallel** that 'figuratively eating the flesh (or words) of the figurative, unblemished, firstborn Passover Lamb (i.e., the Word) will lead to spiritual and eternal life'; recalling that John 1.29 figuratively calls Jesus 'The Lamb of God', and we all know that Jesus was **not** a **literal lamb**. Yet, the **figurative language** that Jesus used in this passage has been given unimaginable interpretations and intentions by the Catholic Church. Jesus spoke almost exclusively in figurative language and parables. As Mark 4.34 says, Jesus Only spoke to the people using parables, and explained things privately to the Apostles; although they still did not understand Him', as noted in Mark 6.52 and Mark 8.17. At the Last Supper in John 16.25-26, right before Jesus is handed over to die, He says "These things I've spoken to you in figurative language, but the time is coming when I will no longer speak to you in figurative language, but I will tell you plainly about the Father. When that day comes, you will ask of the Father in My name on your own behalf". We know from the Book of Revelation (as it is highly figurative) that Jesus was still speaking to John the Apostle <u>in figurative language some 60 years **after** the crucifixion</u>. Thus the phrase "When that <u>day</u> comes" refers to the day of Jesus' 2nd coming; which is 'when He will speak plainly to us'. If Jesus had not spoken in figurative language, His true words would **not** have been **unknowingly** 'passed on' through the generations; they would have been changed or deleted to suit the needs of false leaders and false prophets such as the Catholic Forefathers. Thus the Catholic Church has 'no idea' that they have unknowingly passed down the words that will eventually lead to the fall of their corrupt institution. They have 'no idea' of the true meaning of Jesus' figurative language; realizing that it does not even make sense for Jesus to be the figurative Passover Lamb, then to believe that we must literally 'eat the flesh of something figurative that does not actually exist', as Jesus was a literal Man, not a literal lamb. And so when Jesus returns, He will no longer be speaking with figurative language, but speaking *plainly*, 'striking the Catholic Church and all religions (or false gods) with the sharp twoedged sword (i.e., His words) that goes out of His mouth' (Revelation 19.15).

Jesus referred to <u>Peter as 'a rock'</u>, the kingdom as 'a net', <u>Himself as 'the Gate'</u>, 'the <u>Lamb'</u>, or 'the <u>Word'</u>, and to <u>us as 'the vineyard'</u>, 'branches', or even 'fish'. In all of these instances we can recognize Jesus' figurative or symbolic language; i.e., His metaphors and imagery. So why can't the Catholic

hierarchy recognize words like 'flesh, blood, and body' as also being figurative language? How can they take words like 'rock, net, Gate, and branches' as figurative language, while Simultaneously taking words like 'flesh, blood, and body' as literal language? How is it that the Catholic scholars of 'today and yesterday' - men of supposed literary wisdom - are somehow incapable of interpreting the figurative meaning of 'flesh, blood, and body'? The reason of course is based on 'their lust for supremacy, power, and authority'. The Catholic Forefathers, in their lust to rule 'all the kingdoms of the world', failed Satan's temptation by 'believing his literal interpretations of Jesus' figurative language pertaining to flesh, blood, and body'. By believing those literal interpretations, it meant that the Catholic Church would in fact gain 'control over Jesus', thereby also gaining 'control over nations'. Remember, in the 2nd temptation, Satan literally interpreted the figurative language of Psalm 91 (i.e., 'God shall cover you with feathers') to try and trick Jesus into flying. While Jesus did not believe Satan's literal interpretations, the Catholic Forefathers were in fact tricked into believing Satan's literal interpretations, thus blindly falling deep into idolatry. And unfortunately, due to the Catholic hierarchy's stiff-necked **pride** in their inherited lies (i.e., their **tradition**), they remain blind to the **blatant idolatry** handed down to them by their Catholic Forefathers. They remain 'blind leaders of the blind, leading people into a ditch' (Matthew 15.14) as 'Satan's prized puppet'. They remain 'blind leaders of the blind', blindly <u>repeating</u> as 'Satan's parrots' literal interpretations of Jesus' figurative language. Thus, in order to easily control the multitudes, Catholicism - under the direction of Satan - has simply given literal interpretation to **figurative** verses; noting that this also keeps their <u>lie</u> 'so close to truth that we actually think it's the truth'.

Think about the amount of figurative language we use today. We, just as they have for thousands of years, use figurative language that draws parallels between 'our basic, every day needs and activities' i.e., food (eating and drinking), clothing, shelter, sexuality, etc. - and 'what we are trying to explain'. **Examples** include A) 'They were **fed** wrong information or bogus intelligence.' B) 'He **hungered** after power, or he was <u>drunk</u> on power.' C) 'She was <u>wearing</u> a smile.' D) 'Their house is divided.' E) 'His house is corrupted.' F) 'She's married to money.' G) 'They (2 businesses, politicians, etc.) are in bed together.' So to no surprise, 'activities that are <u>central</u> to our life' are frequently used in figurative speech. In particular, 'eating and drinking' seem to be used with the greatest frequency to convey 'what we are trying to explain'. Consider the following figures of speech. 'He was chewing my ear off'. Everyone in today's world knows that 'he was chewing my ear off' figuratively means 'he would not stop talking'. But will people in the future interpret this as 'he was eating my ear'; 'he was a Cannibal'? We also use figurative language such as 'eat my profit' to mean 'I lost money', 'eating it up' to mean 'I liked the attention', 'what's eating you' to mean 'what's bothering you', or even <u>'eat my words' to mean</u> 'I had to humble myself by being forced to admit I was wrong'; something all religious leaders will be doing in the near future. These examples show 5 very different meanings for 'eating' that do not actually mean 'to eat'; i.e., 'to ingest something physically through the mouth and into the stomach'. Thus we are <u>naïve</u> to think that they did not use figurative language 2000 years ago, when our language today uses such a great deal of figurative language in everyday life. Here it must be mentioned that, if even the Catholic hierarchy can concede that Revelation 19.18 and Ezekiel 39.18 are speaking figuratively about 'eating the flesh and drinking the blood of kings, captains, princes, etc.' - which is drawing the image of these people being *cut down* and *destroyed* by Jesus' judgment - then how can they not concede that Christ was also speaking figuratively about 'eating His flesh and drinking His blood' double meaning, foreshadowing that this ultimately gives 'eating Jesus' flesh and drinking His blood' double meaning, foreshadowing to His crucifixion and death... an event necessary for 'the salvation of humanity' or 'eternal life'. Note also here that Jeremiah 51.34-35 uses this same figurative language of being 'devoured, eaten, and then spit out by Nebuchadnezzar', having 'violence done to him', and even mentioning (just like Jesus) that 'The violence is done to his flesh and his blood'.

So, with Jesus telling us 'point-blank' that He uses figurative language, and considering that we <u>still</u> use the <u>same</u> figurative language of 'eating things that are <u>not actually eaten</u>', do you really <u>think</u> that Jesus (being the <u>figurative Passover Lamb</u>) intended for us to 'literally eat His flesh and drink His blood' in <u>order to attain eternal life</u>? The idea of 'eating something and it making you clean' <u>does not agree</u> with the <u>fundamental</u> teachings of Christ. In <u>Matthew 15.11-19</u> and <u>Mark 7.18-19</u>, Jesus says:

'Do you not yet understand? The <u>food</u> that goes <u>into</u> your <u>mouth</u> does <u>not</u> make you <u>spiritually</u> <u>unclean</u>. Rather, it is the <u>words</u> that men speak <u>from</u> their <u>mouth</u> that are the cause of spiritual uncleanliness. <u>Anything that goes into your mouth</u>, <u>does not go into your heart</u>, <u>but</u> <u>goes into your stomach and is eliminated</u>. Therefore <u>nothing you eat</u> (or nothing from the outside) can enter your heart and make you <u>spiritually unclean</u>.'

In this passage it is **key** to understand that it would be 'double minded' and thus impossible for Christ to assert that 'nothing you eat can make you spiritually **unclean**' without Christ **simultaneously** asserting that 'nothing you eat can make you spiritually **clean**'. So by **simple deduction** it is obvious that 'nothing you eat can make you spiritually clean or unclean'. Therefore if Jesus says that 'nothing we eat can enter our heart and make us spiritually clean', then it would be double minded and thus impossible for the same Man to turn around and tell us that 'eating His actual flesh and **drinking** His actual blood (i.e., the Eucharist) will make us spiritually **clean**; will lead to eternal life'. Remembering that a <u>double thought</u> combines a 'Yes' and a 'No' in one thought to create a nonsense thought, the Catholic misinterpretation of John 6.54 essentially asserts that Jesus was double minded by teaching the *double thought*: 'it <u>does not matter</u> what you eat to be spiritually clean (<u>No</u>) {i.e., Matthew 15.11-19 and Mark 7.18-19}, but it does matter what you eat to be spiritually clean (Yes)' (i.e., John 6.54}. And so by breaking down Catholicism's double thoughts into 'simplest terms' it becomes obvious that their interpretations are pathetically nonsensical; are <u>mis</u>interpretations. It becomes obvious that they are speaking a total nonsense statement similar to 'I do not like blue (No), but I like blue (Yes)'. And by breaking down Catholicism's double thoughts into 'simplest terms', it also becomes obvious as to the *origin* of their lies and nonsense misinterpretations: the *Evil One*, who speaks with a double tongue, letting his 'No' be a 'Yes', and his 'Yes' be a 'No' in one thought to cause confusion and division (Matthew 5.37). Therefore, to believe the Catholic interpretation that 'we are to actually eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ in order to gain eternal life', is to 'believe the double minded

thoughts of <u>Satan</u>' and to '<u>oppose</u> the very essence of <u>Christ's teaching</u> in Matthew 15.11-19 and Mark 7.18-19': '<u>nothing</u> you <u>eat</u> can make you <u>spiritually clean</u> or <u>unclean</u>'. Additionally, it must be noted that in fact '<u>nothing</u> from the outside - such as 'water baptism' and 'anointing the sick with oil' - can make you <u>spiritually clean</u> or <u>unclean</u>'.

The idea of eating 'spiritually charged food' - i.e., the Eucharist - to become 'one with the gods' is a pagan mindset that was prevalent in the Roman Empire; remembering of course that their name is Roman Catholic. So the belief in simply 'eating flesh and drinking blood to be made spiritually clean and one with Jesus and God' - which in itself is highly suggestive of pagan Roman influence - is the belief in pagan rituals and superstition; i.e., normalized magic, witchcraft, and sorcery. And it is the mentality of the Evil One which totally contradicts Jesus' teaching. So - clarifying first that 'heart', in this and most biblical contexts, refers to your 'figurative, spiritual heart', not your 'literal, physical heart', and your 'figurative heart' can be said to be SYNONYMOUS with your 'inner being' or your 'SOUI or Spirit' what you eat cannot and does not have any influence or bearing on your heart, soul, or spirit. What you eat 'goes into your stomach and is eliminated'. What you eat does not come in contact with your spirit as it is being digested; or it 'does not go into your heart'. To say that 'You are what you eat', as if eating Christ's physical flesh will make you 'spiritually like Christ', is to totally oppose the fundamental teachings of Christ, believing that 'what you eat can somehow enter your heart'. And to say 'You are what you eat' is quite simply a **cannibalistic mentality** reminiscent of **South Pacific cannibals** who 'ate people (i.e., their flesh) with the belief that they were somehow consuming or absorbing that person's spiritual energy into their own inner being'; which again, totally opposes Christ's fundamental teaching (and our common sense) that 'nothing you literally eat can enter your heart, soul, or spirit', meaning that Catholicism has not even progressed past cannibalism in their spiritual understanding. It is important to note that many people will argue, 'If the Eucharist does not affect my spirit (i.e., heart or soul), then why do I feel at peace after eating the Eucharist?' First of all, someone can drink a beer and then feel at peace; that does not mean that 'the beer was spiritually cleansing' or 'the beer made them one with God'. If this were so, then we could start arguing that 'eating chocolate or pizza, drinking coffee or tea, petting an animal, walking by a quiet stream, or going on a mountain hike are all **activities** that are **spiritually cleansing**, and therefore **essential for salvation**, and anyone **not** partaking in these activities will go to hell'. Hence the Eucharist is NO MOre 'spiritually charged or spiritually cleansing' than a slice of pizza, and any spiritual peace that a Catholic feels after eating the Eucharist is most likely a <u>Subsiding</u> of the <u>guilt</u> and <u>fear</u> (in terms of 'fulfilling your obligation') that Catholicism has inflicted by threatening eternal damnation for 'not eating and worshiping the Eucharist'. The Catholic Church (specifically the hierarchy) simply believes in something they do not understand, yet the idea that 'food <u>cannot</u> enter your heart, soul, or spirit' is such a **basic concept**. And so they believe the nonsense of Satan's double tongue, throwing out all basic logic and reasoning, because their 'pride, vanity, and envy for God's supremacy' keeps them with a veil of ignorance over their minds. Satan has 'fed them' his false knowledge (i.e., wrong information), and they have willingly eaten it because it was disguised as the desirable fruit of power and authority. And so by 'wanting to be

supreme like God', the Catholic hierarchy has remained blind to the simplest of concepts: 'Anything that goes into your mouth, does not go into your heart, but goes into your stomach and is eliminated'.

Thus, the Catholic hierarchy blindly practices 'normalized magic, witchcraft, and sorcery', asserting that their 'spiritually charged Eucharist' can somehow enter your heart, soul, or spirit, making you 'spiritually clean and one with Jesus and God'. And by asserting that the Eucharist can somehow enter your heart, soul, or spirit, the Catholic hierarchy opposes the basic knowledge of Christ, and 'says without saying' that 'It is Christ who is the liar'; which is a clear indicator that the Catholic hierarchy blindly and unknowingly speaks on behalf of Satan. The teaching of Christ is clear: 'Nothing you eat has any bearing on your heart, soul, or spirit'. Therefore, to believe that 'the Eucharist can make you spiritually clean, consequently bringing eternal life' is to believe teaching that is anti-Christ.

So what does make you spiritually clean? What brings eternal life? Jesus says to the Apostles at the Last Supper, "You are already clean because of the WOrd which I've spoken to you" (John 15.3). It is important to note that Jesus said 'You are clean because of My word' AFTER the Apostles had eaten the Last Supper; as noted in John 13.2. So we must realize that, if the Last Supper was 'the true institution of the Eucharist' as the Catholic hierarchy asserts, then Jesus would have told the Apostles that 'they were clean because of what they had just eaten'. But He did not, which again reinforces Jesus' basic teaching that 'nothing you eat can make you spiritually clean or unclean'. The **words** that Jesus spoke make us spiritually clean, and nothing we eat, whether it is bread or flesh, can possibly make us spiritually clean or unclean. Jesus' true words - which of course center on simply 'loving one another' - bring eternal life. But false words - i.e., false interpretations of Jesus' words - from false teachers bring eternal death. As Jesus says in Matthew 15.11, 'The words that people speak cause spiritual uncleanliness'. In Genesis, God spoke words and the physical world came into being. If you defile God's word with false words, then you defile <u>all that He has created</u>; including Jesus and humanity itself. False words - that is *false* interpretations of the word of God - cause 'division, war, and hate', ultimately defiling and destroying humanity, and bringing about eternal death on unknowing multitudes of people. Therefore to truly be spiritually clean, we must know the true words of God; that is 'the true interpretations of the word of God'. And those true interpretations were only spoken by Jesus: 'the Word'.

Jesus was the living Being who represented 'the true interpretations of the word of God'. In Jesus, God's thoughts, words, and personality were given a human mouth from which to speak; hence 'Jesus spoke what God thought'. 'Jesus' = 'the persona of God manifested in a human being'. I.e., 'the persona of Jesus' = 'the persona of God'. Hebrews 1.3 says 'Jesus is the express image of God's person'. If God felt, thought, or acted a certain way, then those feelings, thoughts, and actions were transmitted into the physical realm through Jesus. Therefore Jesus was 'the word of God that physically came alive', and so was referred to as 'the Word'; realizing again that Jesus is not 'a literal word written on a page' or 'a literal word spoken from someone's mouth', but rather 'the figurative Word'. So Jesus was God's voice manifested in a living, breathing human Being; He was God's voice 'in the flesh' or 'incarnate'. John sets up his entire gospel with the equation that 'Jesus' flesh (or living, breathing body) is equivalent to the word of God' because Jesus physically spoke God's word - what God thought and

how God felt - 'in the flesh' or 'in person'. John 1.14 says "And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us". When Jesus refers to His incarnate flesh, He is referring to 'the word of God'.

I.e., 'flesh' was used by Jesus as a metaphor for 'His words'. So, when Jesus says "Eat My flesh", He means 'Eat the word of God' or 'Feed on My words'; understanding that 'eating or feeding on the word of God' was common terminology used by the Prophets to mean 'receive into your heart and soul the word of God'. Examples of this terminology are later in this Section. Thus the implied meaning of 'Jesus' flesh' is quite simply 'Jesus' words'; which of course are synonymous with God's words.

And so the true interpretation of John 6.54 says 'We must eat Jesus' words, not His flesh, to gain eternal life'; realizing here that, as Jesus = the figurative Word = the figurative Passover Lamb, and the Jews were quite familiar with 'eating the flesh of a literal Passover lamb every year', then it becomes quite obvious that Jesus said 'Eat My flesh', to figuratively parallel something that was literal, with 'figuratively eating Jesus' flesh (i.e., words) to gain spiritual life' being paralleled to 'literally eating a lamb's flesh to gain (or keep) physical life'.

In <u>Matthew 4.4</u>, Jesus replies to Satan by saying "Man <u>does not live on bread</u> alone, but <u>on every word</u> that proceeds from the mouth of <u>God</u>". In this verse Jesus is making a <u>distinction</u> between '<u>physical</u> <u>bread</u> that goes into your mouth, then into your stomach and is eliminated' and '<u>spiritual bread</u> that is received into your heart and soul'. 'Spiritual bread' figuratively means 'the word of God'. Think of how we use 'bread' in today's world to <u>figuratively convey</u>, just as Jesus was trying to convey 2000 years ago, that something is <u>essential</u> or <u>a staple to live</u>; i.e., think of the terms 'bread' = 'money', 'bread and butter' = 'steady work', etc). And so 'man <u>lives on</u>', or figuratively '<u>eats as a staple for eternal life</u>', 'spiritual bread from heaven'; which is 'the word of God'. In other words:

'the word of God' = '<u>spiritual</u> bread from heaven', <u>not</u> '<u>physical</u>bread' or 'the word of God' = 'bread for your **soul**', not 'bread for your **stomach'**

Noting that John 6.54 says 'We must <u>eat the word of Jesus</u> (i.e., <u>God</u>) to gain <u>eternal life</u>', and that Matthew 15.11 says '<u>Nothing you eat</u> can make you <u>spiritually clean</u> or <u>unclean</u>', the essence of Matthew 4.4 says:

- A) 'Man <u>does not live</u> on <u>bread</u> alone' = 'man <u>does not gain eternal life</u> by simply <u>eating physical</u> <u>bread</u>, or bread for his <u>stomach</u>'. Physical bread, such as the <u>Eucharist</u>, 'goes into your mouth, then it to your stomach and is eliminated'. Physical bread <u>cannot enter your heart</u> to make you spiritually clean or unclean. Physical bread, such as the Eucharist, <u>cannot bring</u> about eternal life, as it is merely <u>bread for</u> your **stomach**.
- B) 'Man <u>does</u> live on every <u>word</u> that proceeds from the mouth of God' = 'Man <u>does</u> gain eternal life by <u>eating spiritual bread from heaven</u>, or bread for his <u>soul</u>'. Spiritual bread, 'the word of God', is <u>received into your heart</u> and is the <u>only</u> thing that can make you spiritually clean. Spiritual bread, 'the word of God', brings about eternal life, as it is bread for your **soul**.

Only God's word can penetrate your heart and soul to give eternal life. The Eucharist is merely a piece of *physical* bread that 'goes into your stomach and is eliminated'; it can't penetrate your heart or your soul. And so the Eucharist is bread for your stomach, not bread for your soul; making 'the Eucharist' (physical bread) and 'the word of God' (spiritual bread) two very different breads. Thus, in Matthew 4.4 Jesus was 'in effect' saying 'Man does not gain eternal life by eating physical bread that goes into his stomach and is eliminated. But man does gain eternal life by eating spiritual bread that goes into his heart and soul'. And this bread for your soul is of course 'the word of God'. Therefore it is key to recognize for the following discussion on 'Jesus being the living bread from heaven', that Matthew 4.4 makes the identification 'the word of God' = 'bread from heaven'.

If Matthew 4.4 in fact identifies 'the word of God' = 'bread from heaven', then 'Jesus, the living **breathing** Word' = 'living bread from heaven'. So it is key to recognize that it is Jesus, the actual living breathing human Being, that is 'living bread from heaven'. I.e., it is 'the living breathing Jesus in the flesh' that is 'living bread from heaven'; not 'Jesus' dead flesh', as the Catholic hierarchy claims the Eucharist to be. Even if you consumed an actual piece of Jesus' flesh from the Man Himself, it is <u>not possible</u> for that '<u>dead flesh'</u> to be '<u>living</u> bread from heaven' because 'the piece of flesh' on its own cannot breathe, walk, or talk; it is 'dead flesh' and therefore food like any other that 'does not go into your heart'. It is food that 'goes into your mouth, then into your stomach and is eliminated'. It is <u>food</u> that 'cannot make you spiritually clean or unclean'. It is <u>food</u> (or physical bread) that is 'for your stomach, not your soul'. Jesus clarifies to the Jews in John 6.32-33 that 'The manna (i.e., physical bread) their ancestors ate in the desert (Exodus 16.4) was **not** true bread from heaven'. 'True bread from heaven' is 'the word of God', and Jesus ('the Word' in the flesh) is 'the true living bread from heaven'; while the Eucharist is 'false living bread' simply because it cannot breathe, walk, or talk. Jesus continues in John 6.48-54; "I am the bread of life. Your fathers ate manna (physical bread for your **stomach)** in the wilderness and are dead. I am the **living bread** which came down from heaven. If anyone eats of this bread he will live forever; and the bread that I shall give is My flesh. Whoever eats My flesh and <u>drinks My blood</u> has <u>eternal life</u>, and I will raise him up at the last day". Jesus referred to Himself as living bread because He could breathe, walk, and talk; He was alive. And remembering that 'Jesus' flesh' = 'Jesus' words', Jesus uses 'His living, breathing flesh' as a metaphor for 'living bread from heaven'. Therefore:

'Jesus in the flesh' = 'living bread from heaven'

It is important to understand that *it is <u>not Jesus' actual flesh</u>* (i.e., the <u>supposed flesh</u> of Jesus in the <u>Eucharist</u>) *that is 'bread from heaven'*. Rather it is 'Jesus in the flesh' - the living breathing Christ who physically speaks God's true thoughts and true words - *that is 'living bread from heaven'*. So knowing that it would be <u>impossible</u> to 'eat Jesus in the flesh' - of course implying that you are actually 'eating Someone who is <u>alive'</u>, which makes absolutely <u>no sense</u> - 'to eat living bread from heaven' = 'to eat or feed on the words <u>Spoken</u> by the actual, living breathing Christ'. Again 'eating living bread from heaven' <u>does not mean</u> 'eating Jesus' actual, living breathing body'. You must

know the difference in order to recognize 'Satan's <u>lie</u> that is so close to the truth that you think it's the truth'. You must know the difference in order to 'sort the wheat from the tares'. 'Jesus in the flesh' speaks 'the word of God' (i.e., spiritual bread) that nourishes your heart and soul. 'Jesus' actual flesh' (i.e., physical bread) can only nourish your stomach, not your soul. Jesus' flesh is not alive, therefore it is impossible for 'Jesus' dead flesh' (i.e., as Catholicism asserts the Eucharist is) to be 'the <u>living</u> bread which came down from heaven'. Remember, 'God is the God of the <u>living</u>, not the <u>dead</u>'. And so 'the worship of the dead flesh of Jesus' - just like any other dead, false idol - is the work of man and Satan, not the Living Jesus or the Living God.

Genesis 2.7 says "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being". Flesh that does not have the breath of God's Spirit is merely "dust of the ground". The Eucharist, even if it was the actual flesh of Jesus, is merely "dust of the ground" if it does not contain the breath of God's Spirit; it is dead flesh if it does not contain the breath of God's Spirit. Therefore the Eucharist - the supposed dead flesh of Jesus - cannot be 'the living bread from heaven' because it is not a 'living being'; i.e., it lacks "the breath of life" from God's Spirit as stated in Genesis 2.7. The Eucharist is a dead, inanimate false idol just like any other dead, lifeless idol that you read about in the Old Testament (see also 'the story of Daniel and Bel' in Section 3). Regardless if you think that the Eucharist is 'the actual flesh of Jesus', it is impossible that it is Jesus simply because it cannot breathe! Jesus was living bread; He could breathe, walk, and talk. Again, 'flesh without the breath of God's Spirit' is 'dead flesh', and the same as "dust of the ground"; which makes the Eucharist, the supposed 'dead flesh of Jesus', the same as any other 'dead, lifeless false idol'.

Think about it. The flesh is merely a *vessel* to house the spirit. Once the spirit leaves the flesh, it stops breathing and the flesh becomes worthless and meaningless. As James 2.26 says, "The body without the spirit is dead". Without the spirit, the body (or 'the flesh') returns to "dust of the ground". 'Flesh without a spirit' is no longer 'the living being that you once identified as a person'. The flesh ceases to be 'the person you once knew' once they breathe their last breath. Likewise, 'the dead flesh of Jesus' is 'no longer Jesus' once God's Spirit, or His breath of life, has left the fleshy body which once contained the Spirit of Jesus. Therefore, since 'Jesus' flesh without a spirit is no more than dust of the ground', then 'the Eucharist can, at best, be no more than dust of the ground'; as it too contains no spirit. And if the Eucharist has no spirit or 'breath of life', then it is impossible for the Eucharist to be alive, and hence impossible for the Eucharist to be 'living bread from heaven'.

Jesus, the <u>actual Man</u> who walked this earth 2000 years ago, was 'the <u>true</u> living bread from heaven' because He could breathe, walk, and talk; He physically spoke the <u>words</u> of eternal life. The Catholic Church worships an <u>inanimate object</u> and tells us that it is 'the living bread from heaven'; 'the body, blood, <u>soul</u>, and divinity of Christ'. <u>If</u> the Eucharist was the <u>true</u> 'living bread from heaven', then it could of course - just as the Man who lived 2000 years ago - breathe, walk, and talk; <u>they claim that it</u> <u>supposedly has a soul, right</u>? But the fact is that the Eucharist can do none of these things because 'it does <u>not</u> have a <u>soul</u>'; it is without the breath of God's Spirit, and thus it is quite simply <u>dead</u>.

The Eucharist is very much the same as any of the Old Testament 'carved images or statues' that could **not** walk, talk, breathe, or save the people. The priest must <u>walk</u> the Eucharist around. The priest must <u>speak</u> for the Eucharist. And just as it says in Revelation 13.15 about 'the Image of the Beast', the priest (Pope) must 'breathe life' into the Eucharist. Unfortunately it is false life, and the Eucharist is at best 'dead flesh' or 'dust of the ground', as it is God alone who breathes true life into 'dust of the ground'.

Remember that "God is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living" (Mark 12.27). And if the Eucharist is dead, inanimate, and lifeless, then it is work of men and Satan, who only have the ability to 'breathe false life'.

As already mentioned, Jesus' <u>unbelieving</u> or <u>false disciples</u> could not understand Jesus' figurative language, <u>thinking</u> (as <u>noted in John 6.52</u>) that 'Jesus actually wanted them to eat His flesh'. So it is <u>imperative</u> to note the <u>division</u> between 'Jesus' <u>true disciples</u>' and 'His <u>false disciples</u>' after He said in John 6.54, "Whoever eats My flesh and drinks My blood has eternal life". Jesus' figurative language of 'flesh and blood' made many of His disciples (in verse 60) say "This is a hard saying, who can <u>understand</u> it?" So in John 6.63 Jesus **clarified** His figurative language, essentially saying 'You must eat My words, <u>not My actual flesh</u> to gain eternal life'. Or, "It is the Spirit who gives life, the <u>flesh profits nothing</u>. The <u>words that I speak</u> to you are Spirit, and they are life". To further clarify, John 6.63 translates as follows; noting that 'the flesh' in "the flesh profits nothing" is implied to be 'Jesus' flesh', as the <u>previous 15</u> Verses are pertaining to 'figuratively eating Jesus' flesh'.

John 6.63 John

John 6.63 (translated)

It is the Spirit who gives <u>life</u>, = The Spirit of God gives <u>eternal life</u>.

the <u>flesh profits nothing</u>. = Eating <u>My flesh</u> is <u>physical bread</u> that <u>profits</u> the soul nothing, and cannot give eternal life.

The <u>words</u> that I speak to you are Spirit, = But the <u>words</u> that I speak are <u>spiritual bread</u>, being of the Spirit,

and (so the <u>words</u> that I speak to you) are <u>life</u>. = thus eating the <u>words</u> that I speak gives <u>eternal life</u>.

life.

So in this one verse (63) Jesus <u>clearly reveals</u> that '<u>eating His actual flesh</u> will bring <u>no spiritual profit</u> or benefit'. But through extrapolation, it <u>also</u> becomes <u>clear</u> that verse 63 is stating 'eating Jesus' <u>flesh'</u> = 'eating Jesus' <u>words</u>'. For clarity, momentarily <u>omit</u> 'drinking Jesus' blood' in verse 54, then <u>compare</u> verse <u>54</u> to verse <u>63</u> (last line of translated verse) in John chapter 6.

Verse <u>54</u> says 'Whoever <u>eats</u> My <u>flesh</u> has <u>eternal life</u>'.

Verse <u>63</u> says '<u>Eatina</u> the <u>words</u> that I speak gives <u>eternal life</u>'.

Once these 2 verses are <u>compared</u>, it is quite obvious that Jesus used 'eating His **flesh**' and 'eating His **words**' <u>interchangeably</u>. Or in equation format:

Since **verse** <u>54</u> says 'eating Jesus' <u>flesh</u>' = 'eternal life', and **verse** <u>63</u> says 'eating Jesus' <u>words</u>' = 'eternal life',

then 'eating Jesus' flesh' = 'eating Jesus' words'.

But even after explaining and clarifying Himself in verse 63, it says in verse 66, "From that time many of Jesus' disciples went back and walked with Him no more"; these were not Jesus' true disciples. Jesus' twelve true disciples understood His figurative language; the metaphor that 'eating Jesus' flesh' = 'eating Jesus' words'. Verse 68 says, "Simon Peter answered Jesus saying, 'Lord to whom shall we go? You have the **words of eternal life**". If Jesus' actual flesh brought eternal life, would Peter, the supposed 1st Pope of Catholicism, not have said 'Lord to whom shall we go? Eating Your flesh brings eternal life.' But he didn't. Instead, Peter reiterated what Jesus said in verse 63: 'Eating the words that Jesus speaks gives eternal life'. Or as in verse 68, 'You have the words of eternal life'. So Jesus' true disciples, His Apostles, understood that 'eating Jesus' flesh' actually meant 'feeding on His words'. Jesus' true disciples understood that 'physically ingesting Jesus' flesh through their mouth could not purify their heart or make them spiritually clean or unclean', while Jesus' false disciples thought (see verse 52) that Jesus actually wanted them to 'eat His flesh'. Thus the Catholic interpreters and hierarchy - who **believe** that 'eating Jesus' flesh will bring eternal life' - are obviously 'of the same **false** disciples' who turned back and would not follow Jesus anymore because 'they could not understand His teaching'. The Catholic interpreters and hierarchy are false apostles who never would have followed the true Christ; and their blatant misinterpretations of Jesus' words prove it.

Before discussing the figurative meaning of 'drinking Jesus' blood' in John 6.54, it will help to explore the **Origins** of 'bread from heaven', which ties together with 'water from the rock in the desert'; ultimately making the <u>parallel</u> that 'figuratively eating Jesus' flesh and drinking Jesus' blood for <u>spiritual</u> survival' originates from 'the Israelites actually eating bread and drinking water for physical survival in the desert'. 'Bread from heaven' refers to the physical bread or 'manna' that the starving Israelites ate in the desert to physically stay alive (see Exodus 16.4, 14, 15, 31, and 35). Exodus chapter 16 says 'Every morning the layer of dew would lift to reveal a small white grain on the ground. This was the bread or manna that God said would rain from heaven.' But although the manna came from the sky, which was perceived as heaven, Jesus clarifies in John 6.32 that 'The manna our ancestors ate was not true bread from heaven, but rather just 'bread from the sky"; as 'bread from heaven' implies some kind of spiritual <u>value</u>, of which the manna had <u>none</u>. So Jesus is trying to set up a **distinction** between 'physical food that keeps you alive physically' and 'spiritual food that keeps you alive spiritually or eternally' by drawing on parallels to 'Moses and their time in the desert'. Think about it. Jesus was stressing that 'their ancestors **physically** ate something and it did **nothing** for them in terms of gaining eternal life' (John 6.49). Then Catholicism has taken this same passage (John chapter 6) and distorted it to mean the **exact opposite**: that we can 'physically eat the Eucharist to gain eternal life'. Jesus even says in John 6.27, 'Do not labor for food that perishes, but labor for food which endures forever'. Obviously, the Eucharist is 'food that perishes', but, as Jesus says in Matthew 24.35, 'Heaven and earth will pass away, but My Words will endure forever'. Comparing John 6.27 and Matthew 24.35 reveals that 'the only food that endures forever is the word of Jesus', not the Eucharist or any other perishable, physical food; once again stating the importance of 'eating the non-perishable words of Christ', not 'the perishable

flesh of Christ' (i.e., the 'supposed' flesh of Christ in the Eucharist). And so Jesus was trying to draw parallels between 'His message' and 'what the Jewish people were already familiar with'; which of course was 'Moses and the Israelites time in the desert surviving on physical food'. I.e., Jesus was drawing parallels between 'physical food that kept their ancestors alive physically' and 'spiritual food (His words) that would keep them alive spiritually and eternally'; remembering of course the parallel between 'literally eating the flesh of a literal Passover <u>lamb</u> for <u>physical</u> life (being passed over by the death plague in Egypt)' and 'figuratively eating the flesh (or words) of the figurative Passover Lamb (i.e., the Word) for spiritual and eternal life'. Now immediately after 'the bread from heaven in Exodus chapter 16', the Israelites continued on to a place that had no water. And so in Exodus chapter 17, after the people were all physically dying of thirst, God instructs Moses to 'Strike the rock of Horeb, and water will come out of the rock'. Moses did as God commanded, and so the Israelites had 'physical drink that kept them alive physically'. This of course creates the **symbolic parallel** that 'physical water came from a physical rock to keep the Israelites physically alive', just as 'spiritual water (i.e., living water) comes from Jesus, the *spiritual Rock* (i.e., Fountain of living water), to keep people *spiritually and* eternally alive'; noting that Paul, in 1 Corinthians 10.4, refers to Jesus as the 'spiritual Rock', which can also be equated to the 'Fountain of living water' (see Jeremiah 2.13, in addition to 'Revelation 21.6 & Revelation 22.13', which states Jesus and God both being 'the Alpha and Omega', therefore both being the 'Fountain of living water'). Hence, Jesus used the symbolic parallels of bread and water, as the Jews were quite familiar with the idea that their ancestors 'physically survived on physical bread and <u>water</u>'. As Nehemiah 9.15 says "God gave them <u>bread</u> from heaven for their <u>hunger</u>, and brought them water out of the rock for their thirst".

Thus, Jesus is drawing on these 'elements of familiarity (i.e., bread and water) that their ancestors physically survived on' in hopes of conveying to the Jews that 'His food and drink would allow them to survive spiritually and eternally'. Jesus uses these two elements of 'bread and water' saying 'We must eat living bread from heaven to gain eternal life' (John 6.51 which was previously quoted), and 'We must also drink living water to gain eternal life'. I.e., in John 4.10&14, Jesus says to 'the woman at the well', 'If you would have asked, I would have given you living water. This water is not like the physical water from Jacob's well where you drink of it and then thirst again. Whoever drinks of living water shall never thirst, and it shall become in them a fountain of living water springing up into eternal life'.

Basically, just as they physically survived in the desert on physical bread and water, so too will we spiritually and eternally survive on living bread and living water; noting that Jesus represents both 'living bread' (see John 6.51) and 'living water' (see Jeremiah 2.13, Revelation 21.6, and Revelation 22.13). Now since John 6.54 says "Whoever eats My flesh and drinks My blood has eternal life", and 'John 6.51 and John 4.14' says 'Whoever eats living bread and drinks living water has eternal life', then we know that:

'eating <u>Jesus' flesh'</u> = 'eating <u>living bread'</u> = 'eating (i.e., feeding on) <u>Jesus' words'</u>

and

'drinking <u>Jesus' blood</u>' = 'drinking <u>living water</u>' = 'believing in (i.e., <u>conceding to</u>) Jesus' words in order to receive the <u>Holy Spirit</u>' (which is discussed as follows).

Again John 6.54 says "Whoever eats My flesh and drinks My blood has eternal life". Just as Jesus used 'His flesh' as a metaphor for 'His words', He also used 'His blood' as a metaphor for 'the Holy Spirit'. To clarify, 'eating Jesus' flesh' is used as a metaphor for 'feeding on Jesus' words', and 'drinking Jesus' blood' is used as a metaphor for 'believing in Jesus' words in order to receive the Holy Spirit'. Without blood, the flesh is dead. Therefore without 'believing in Jesus' words and receiving the Holy Spirit', Jesus' words are also dead. I.e., just as you need both 'flesh and blood' to have physical life, you need both 'words and Spirit' to have eternal life. And so the following is meant to prove that 'drinking Jesus' blood' is metaphorically equivalent to 'believing in Jesus' words in order to receive the Holy Spirit', and it is this belief that is essential for eternal life; not 'drinking Jesus' actual blood'. John 7.37-39 says "On the last day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried out saying, 'If anyone is thirsty let him come to Me and drink. He who believes in Me, out of his heart will flow rivers of living water'. But this Jesus spoke

concerning the Spirit, whom those who believed in Him would receive; for the Holy Spirit was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified". "He who believes in Me" and "concerning the Spirit, whom those who believed in Him would receive" are the key phrases. If you 'drank of Jesus' - which is implied as 'drinking Jesus' living water to have within you a fountain of living water' (see John 4.14) - then that meant that you 'believed in Jesus' and would consequently 'receive the Holy Spirit'. Therefore from John 7.37-39 it is indisputable that:

'drinking living water' = 'believing in Jesus' words in order to receive the Holy Spirit'.

And since (from the previous equations) 'drinking <u>living water</u>' = 'drinking <u>Jesus' blood</u>',

we can thus **conclude** that: 'drinking Jesus' blood' = 'believing in Jesus' words in order to receive the Holy Spirit'.

And so this is why Paul says, "We have all been made to drink into one Spirit" (1 Corinthians 12.13). By metaphorically 'drinking living water' or 'drinking Jesus' blood' we are professing that 'We believe in Jesus' words', thereby 'receiving the Holy Spirit', and thus belonging to one Spirit as one body of people. Note also that, while 'eating flesh' implies a <u>single meaning</u> of 'feeding on words', 'drinking blood' implies a *paired meaning* of both 'believing' and 'receiving'. These 2 cannot be separated; you can't 'receive the Holy Spirit' without first 'believing in Jesus'. As Peter says in Acts 11.17, 'When we believed in Jesus, God gave us and the Gentiles (i.e., they received) the same gift of the Holy Spirit'. Furthermore, you cannot actually drink 'spiritually charged blood' - as pagan Roman Catholicism believes - and expect to receive the Holy Spirit. You must **believe** Jesus' true words - and **not** the distorted words of modern <u>day religions</u> - to <u>receive</u> the Holy Spirit. Drinking the actual blood of Jesus, just as eating His actual flesh, cannot make you spiritually clean; i.e., Jesus' actual blood, just like His flesh, is physical food that 'profits your **spirit** nothing'. Jesus' actual blood "does not go into your heart, but goes into your stomach and is then eliminated". It does not come in contact with your spirit as it is being digested. It does not have any bearing or influence on your heart, soul, or spirit; to say that it does, totally contradicts the fundamental teachings of Christ in Matthew 15.11-19 and Mark 7.18-19. Look at this example using the figurative language of 'drinking without physically ingesting through the mouth'; i.e., 'drinking without actually drinking'. In Mark 10.38, Jesus asks James and John "Can you drink the cup of <u>suffering</u> that I must drink?" Obviously 'drinking a cup of suffering' is <u>figurative</u>, and by doing so, a person <u>would not</u> 'physically ingest suffering' through their mouth and into their stomach, as if it was food. I.e., can someone really pour you 'a cup of suffering' and you physically drink it? Obviously not. Thus, this is just one more biblical example of figuratively and metaphorically 'drinking something that is <u>not</u> physically or literally drank', just as 'living water' and 'Jesus' blood' are <u>not</u> physically or literally drank. And so again, physically drinking something, whether it is 'blood, water, coffee, soda, or beer' 'profits the soul nothing', and to believe anything else is to <u>oppose</u> the fundamental teachings of Christ.

Again, without blood, the flesh is dead. Therefore you must have **both** 'flesh and blood' to have **physical life**. Likewise you must have **both** 'words and Spirit' - i.e., 'flesh and blood' - to have **eternal life**. It is **not** enough to merely have knowledge of Jesus' words. You must **believe** and **follow** (or **concede to**) those words - **to clarify, the true words and intentions of Jesus** - in order to **receive** the **Holy Spirit** and gain eternal life. Just as 'the **flesh** is **dead** without **blood**', Jesus' **words** become **dead** without **belief**. This is the essence of what Jesus is conveying in 'The Parable of the Sower' (Matthew 13.3-8). In this parable, 'the <u>seeds</u>' = 'Jesus' words', and 'good ground or bad ground' = 'people who have <u>heard</u> Jesus' words'. The parable essentially says 'The seeds (or words) of Jesus were sown on either good ground or bad ground. Seeds that fell on **bad ground** represent the people who <u>heard</u> the words of Jesus, yet - because Satan's lies choked out the truth of Jesus' words - **did not believe**, and therefore did not yield a crop. The seeds that fell on **good ground** represent the people who <u>heard</u> the words of Jesus and **believed**, therefore yielding a crop. So again, Jesus' words die and 'do not yield a crop' without **belief** in those words, <u>truly **following**</u> and <u>conceding to</u> those words.

There are many who have 'fed on Jesus' words', but either A) 'did not believe', or B) 'they thought that they believed, but actually believed in Satan's misinterpretations of Jesus' words'. Explaining 'The Parable of the Sower', Jesus says 'the deceitfulness of riches choked out the word'; essentially meaning that some are deceived by Satan into thinking that they truly believe, when in fact 'what they believe in' is 'Satan's redefined words of Christ' that offer supremacy, glory, and authority (i.e., riches) in the names of Jesus and God. This is the clever trap set by Satan that many religious leaders have fallen into; i.e., this is the desirable fruit that Satan offers as true knowledge, when in fact it is false knowledge. For supremacy, glory, and authority, religious leaders blindly believe Satan's false interpretations of the words of Christ, thereby being tricked into thinking that they have 'fed on Jesus' words' and 'believed', but 'what they believe in' is 'a lie that has choked out the true intentions of Christ'. Thus you must both 'feed on Jesus' words' and 'believe in (i.e., follow and concede to) the true intentions of those words' in order to receive the Holy Spirit and gain eternal life; which, by the way, is being 'truly clothed', eating from the Tree of Life.

Once it is understood that 'Jesus' teaching on flesh and blood' in John 6.54 is actually 'a teaching on feeding on Jesus' words and believing in Jesus' words', it can now easily be identified that John 6.54 is in fact identical to Jesus' other teachings - noting of course the previous example of 'The Sower' - about 'hearing His words and believing'. The only difference is that John 6.54 is worded using metaphors. So if 'eating Jesus' flesh' = 'feeding on Jesus' words', and 'drinking Jesus' blood' = 'believing in Jesus' words in order to receive the Holy Spirit', we can now recognize that John 5.24 is exactly the same as

John 6.54. Therefore, remembering that 'believing in Jesus' is always the prerequisite for 'receiving the Holy Spirit' - i.e., they are always paired together so that someone cannot 'receive the Holy Spirit without <u>first</u> believing', as noted in John 7.39 - examine the following equations that show (after translating) John 5.24 and John 6.54 are in fact equivalent messages.

John 5.24

"Whoever eats My flesh
= and drinks My blood
has eternal life"

"He who hears My word and believes in Him who sent Me has everlasting life"

And now rewritten to compare John 5.24 to the **translated** version of John 6.54.

=

John 5.24

John 6.54 (translated)

John 6.54

"He who hears My word and believes in Him who sent Me (receives the Holy Spirit and) has everlasting life" 'Whoever feeds on My words and believes in My words, receives the Holy Spirit and has eternal life'

And so this analysis shows how, in John 6.54, Jesus was simply *restating* one of the <u>main themes</u> that He <u>continually repeated</u>: 'We must both <u>hear</u> and <u>believe</u> Jesus' words in order to <u>receive</u> the <u>Holy Spirit</u> and <u>eternal life</u>'. In fact, this main theme is <u>echoed</u> in <u>John 3.16</u>; one of the Bible's most recognizable verses. "For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that <u>whoever believes in Him</u> should not perish but <u>have everlasting life</u>." Belief in the true intentions of Jesus' words - that He came to <u>abolish</u> the supremacy and exclusiveness of religion - is what it means to 'believe in Jesus'. Repeating the words 'I believe in Jesus', as if a magic spell, is meaningless and will do you <u>no good</u> without <u>believing in Jesus'</u> true message. And so just as 'the flesh is dead without blood', 'Jesus' words are dead without belief'; remembering of course that it is belief in the <u>true</u> interpretations of Jesus' words.

Additionally, the Gospel of Philip (150-220 AD) from the Nag Hammadi Scriptures specifically articulates that 'Jesus' use of the words flesh and blood' was purely figurative. The Gospel of Philip (56,26-57,22) says "For this reason Jesus said, 'One who does not eat My flesh and drink My blood does not have life within'. What does this mean? His flesh is the word and His blood is the Holy Spirit." So this pre-Catholic Church writing upholds what is written in John's Gospel that 'flesh = word' and 'blood = Holy Spirit'. The only difference between 'John's and Philip's' is that 'John's is spread out and somewhat hidden in plain sight'. Philip comes right out and tells us the real meaning of Jesus' metaphor or figurative language, 'point blank'. No wonder it was thrown out by the Catholic Forefathers who had ulterior motives of power, glory, and control using 'a false image of Jesus': the Eucharist.

Jesus regularly quoted the Prophets of the Old Testament; as He says in Matthew 5.17, 'I came to <u>fulfill</u> what the Prophets said'. The idea of 'feeding on' or 'eating God's word' was **common**terminology for the Prophets. To 'feed on God's word' is to 'live on His word' as if it is 'bread for our

word that proceeds from the mouth of God'; being aware that 'the mouth of the Catholic Church' is not the same as 'the mouth of God'. And so Jesus was in fact keeping with the figurative language already established 'by God to the Prophets' when He said 'eat My flesh'; if you have the understanding that 'Jesus' flesh' = 'the word of God'. The following is a list of quotes - from both Old and New Testaments - that use the figurative language of 'eating the word of God'.

- 1. Jeremiah 15.16: "O Lord, Your words were found, and I ate them, and Your word was to me the joy and rejoicing of my heart."
- 2. Jeremiah 3.15: "And I (God) will give you <u>shepherds</u> according to My heart, who will <u>feed</u> you with <u>knowledge</u> and <u>understanding</u>."
- 3. John 21.17: "Feed my sheep". This verse is obviously not talking about 'literally giving food to animals', as 'we' = 'the sheep', and 'the feed' = 'the words of Christ'.
- 4. Ezekiel 2.7-10 and 3.1-10: "Thus says the Lord God, 'You (Ezekiel) shall speak My words to them, whether they hear or whether they refuse. Open your mouth and eat what I give you'. When I looked there was a hand stretched out to me and behold a scroll. There was writing (i.e., words) on the inside and on the outside and written on it were lamentations and morning and woe. Then God said to me, 'Son of man, eat what you find, eat this scroll (i.e., the word of God) and go speak to the house of Israel'. So I opened my mouth and He caused me to eat that scroll. He said to me, 'Son of man feed your belly and fill your stomach with this scroll that I give you'. So I ate and it was in my mouth like honey and sweetness. Then God said to me, 'Son of man go to the house of Israel and speak My words to them. Receive into your heart My words that I speak to you."" Notice that, after God tells Ezekiel to 'eat the words on the scroll and then speak those words to the house of Israel', He finishes by saying that 'His words will be received into Ezekiel's heart'. God says this because 'eating a physical scroll will only go into your stomach to be eliminated'; a physical scroll, just as physical bread, cannot enter your heart. But eating spiritual bread from heaven - the word of God - does enter your heart. Thus even God Himself is clarifying here that 'nothing you eat - such as **flesh** or a **scroll** - can enter your heart'; only God's words can be "received into your heart".
- 5. Revelation 10.8-10: "Then the voice from heaven spoke to me (John) and said, 'Go and take the little book which is open in the hand of the angel'. So I went to the angel and said to him, 'Give me the little book (which contains the word of God)'. And he said to me, 'Take and eat it; and it will make your stomach bitter but it will be as sweet as honey in your mouth'. Then I took the little book (containing the word of God) out of the angel's hand and ate it. It was as sweet as honey in my mouth, but when I had eaten it, my stomach became bitter. And he said to me, 'You must prophesy again about many peoples, nations, tongues, and kings'." Therefore, just as in Ezekiel, John eats God's words in order to speak (prophesy) God's words; noting that 'sweet' and 'bitter' were the feelings that John had in his heart from the words. The words did not

'physically taste sweet' or 'physically upset his stomach'; they 'figuratively tasted sweet' and 'figuratively upset his stomach'.

- 6. 1 Timothy 4.6: "Feed yourself spiritually on the words of faith and of the good doctrine which you have carefully followed."
- 7. John 4.32-34: "Jesus said to His disciples, 'I have <u>food to eat</u> of which you do not know. My <u>food</u> is <u>to do the will of Him who sent Me</u>, and to finish His work". Once again Jesus is **figuratively** speaking about 'eating something that is <u>not physically ingested</u> through the mouth'. Jesus is speaking about 'eating the word of God in order to do the <u>will</u> of God'. He is speaking about eating <u>spiritual food</u> for His soul i.e., spiritual bread from heaven <u>not physical food</u> that 'goes into your stomach and is eliminated'.

Additionally, it is interesting to note that 'the story of Adam and Eve' introduces us to the idea of 'eating knowledge' or 'eating words'. We must remember that 'the story of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden' is a symbolically written fable or parable; recognizing of course that 'serpents do not talk' and 'trees do not produce fruit that imparts knowledge'. So the 'metaphorical fruit' on 'the tree of knowledge' represented 'words of knowledge'. But in this case, the 'words' were actually 'Satan's words of <u>false</u> knowledge' that he disguised as 'words of <u>true</u> knowledge'. That is, '<u>the words</u>' that were 'eaten' by Adam and Eve (consuming the words 'into their minds, not their stomachs') represented Satan's defiled version of true right and wrong. They were 'words' that Adam and Eve thought would make them 'like God' (Genesis 3.5), but were really 'words' that only made them more 'like Satan'. As Eve said, "The serpent deceived me, and I ate (his words of false knowledge)" (Genesis 3.13)... thinking that they would make her 'God-like'. And so the Catholic hierarchy - living in 'a mental state of <u>blissful ignorance</u> (i.e., nakedness)' just as Adam and Eve before receiving sight - has <u>also</u> been deceived by the serpent (i.e., Satan). They have eaten Satan's poisonous fruit of 'false knowledge of good and evil', blindly and blissfully believing that it is 'the true knowledge of good and evil that will make them God-like'. But, once the Catholic hierarchy realizes the 'blissful ignorance' that they have inherited from their forefathers (i.e., once they receive sight), they will look down in great shame at their 'nakedness' (or ignorance) and say "The Serpent <u>deceived</u> me, and <u>I ate</u> (his <u>words</u> of false knowledge)"; again reiterating that the 1st page of the Bible speaks about 'figuratively eating words'.

The following is <u>another list</u> to further show the <u>primary importance</u> of 'the <u>words</u> of Jesus and God', and conversely the <u>unimportance</u> of 'Jesus' or anybody's flesh'.

- 1. John 1.14: "The Word became flesh."
- 2. Isaiah 40.6-8: "All flesh is grass. The grass (or <u>flesh</u>) <u>withers</u>, but the <u>word</u> of our God <u>stands</u> <u>forever</u>." Notice the <u>figurative language</u> that 'flesh = grass'. Will the Catholic scholars, with their 'enlightened interpretive abilities', insist that 'we are all <u>literally</u> blades of grass'? Also, notice that this verse corresponds to John 6.63. Here Isaiah is clearly telling us that 'flesh withers and is meaningless, but the <u>word</u> of God is <u>eternal</u>'. While John 6.63 says 'the <u>flesh profits nothing</u> and is meaningless, but the <u>word</u> of God brings eternal life (and is therefore <u>eternal</u>)'.

- 3. John 6.63&68: "The <u>flesh profits nothing</u>. The <u>words</u> that I (Jesus) speak to you are **Spirit**, and they are **life**." "Simon Peter answered Jesus, 'Lord to whom shall we go? You have the <u>words</u> of <u>eternal life</u>."" It is also important to note that in verse 63, Jesus uses the same terminology as Isaiah 'profits nothing' when he is speaking about a false idol. Isaiah 44.9-10 says "Who would form a god or mold an image that profits him nothing? Those who make an <u>image</u>, all of them are useless. Their precious things shall <u>not profit</u>." Jesus' supposed dead flesh, the Eucharist, is a false idol and the <u>same as</u> any of the 'images of gods' that Isaiah says 'will profit nothing'. The Catholic hierarchy 'forms a god' and 'molds an image' to resemble Jesus, but 'Jesus' dead flesh is not the Living Jesus and therefore profits us nothing'. Only the words spoken by the Living Jesus can bring 'spiritual profit' and 'eternal <u>life</u>'.
- 4. John 5.24: "Most assuredly, I (Jesus) say to you, he who hears My word and believes in Him who sent Me has everlasting life." Remember that this is also a parallel quote to John 6.54.
- 5. John 8.51: "Most assuredly, I (Jesus) say to you, if anyone keeps My word he shall never see death." Notice that Jesus **DOES NOT** say 'If anyone eats My flesh he shall never see death'.
- 6. John 15.3: "You are already clean because of the word which I (Jesus) have spoken to you."
- 7. Matthew 4.4: "Man does not live on bread alone, but on every <u>word</u> that proceeds from the mouth of God."
- 8. Matthew 24.35: "Heaven and earth will pass away, but My words will by no means pass away."
- 9. 1 Peter 1.23: "For through the living and eternal word of God you have been born again."

Again, the 1st Commandment is vital to our equality and freedom because, without it, vain men will speak lies from behind 'images and likenesses of God and/or Jesus', thereby creating, implementing, and enforcing man-made laws that oppress and enslave... all in the names of God and Jesus. The 1st **Commandment** says, "You shall not make, serve, or 'bow down to' carved **images**; any likeness of anything that is in heaven or on earth". The Eucharist is 'an image of Jesus' flesh' that is meant to actually be Jesus, body, blood, soul, and divinity. But since the Eucharist cannot breathe, walk, or talk, it is 'a false image of Jesus'. And the Catholic hierarchy has spoken from behind this 'false image of Jesus' to of course create, implement, and enforce man-made laws that ensure their supremacy and our dependence on them; not Jesus or God. Therefore, the Eucharist, a false image of Jesus, represents 'the laws of the false god, Catholicism'; not 'the laws of the one true Jesus', and not 'the laws of the one true God'. Jesus said in Matthew 5.17&19 that 'He came to fulfill the Commandments' and 'Whoever breaks any of the Commandments will be <u>last</u> in God's kingdom'. If Jesus told us that 'no one should <u>break</u> the Commandments', and then were to also tell us to 'break the 1st Commandment by creating and serving an image of Himself', He would be contradicting Himself and speaking with a double tongue. Thus to 'create, serve, and bow down to an image of Jesus' is the commandment of Satan, not Jesus. Think about it; the entire Old Testament is basically an account of 'God telling His servants to destroy carved and molded images'. Then, according to Catholicism, God sent His Son to institute the creation of a

molded image. This makes <u>absolutely no sense</u>, and is yet again another fabrication from the double mind of Satan. Over and over again the Bible tells us that it's all about '<u>word, word, word' NOT 'image, image, image'</u>. Why did Jesus say "<u>My words will not pass away"</u>, but <u>not</u> say 'My <u>flesh</u> will not pass away' or 'My <u>image</u> will not pass away'? 'The <u>words</u> that Jesus spoke give eternal <u>life'</u> (John 6.63). 'A <u>false image</u> of Jesus' - the supposed flesh of Christ represented by the Eucharist - is <u>corruptible</u> and is death; it has 'no spiritual profit'.

Ask yourself, 'What if the Roman soldiers took an actual piece of Jesus' flesh when He died? Would they also truly posses 'living bread from heaven'?' You can see with this example why the 1st Commandment to "not make, serve, or 'bow down to' any image or likeness of anything in heaven or on earth" is so important. It is the root of corruption. If the Roman soldiers could convince people - as Roman Catholicism eventually did - with the combination of 'Jesus' words and Jesus' actual flesh', that they, and only they, possessed true 'living bread from heaven', then they could gain absolute and unrighteous <u>power</u> (also as Roman Catholicism eventually did in the Dark Ages) by 'speaking <u>lies</u> in the name of God' <u>from behind</u> an image of Jesus. Therefore, 'any image or likeness of Jesus, God, or anything perceived to be in heaven', is 'a corruptible image' because vain men, such as the Catholic hierarchy, use them to rule over the multitudes by unrighteous means. Imagine what this world would look like if we never had the Protestant Reformation. America would have never been created and we would still be living under the same **Catholic tyranny** of the Dark Ages. 'The **oppression** of a false god's (Catholicism's) laws' would dominate our lives under the disguise of being 'the freedom of God's laws'. By means of a false image of Jesus (the Eucharist), the vain men of the false god 'Catholicism' - just as they did in middle age Europe - would still have absolute and unrighteous rule over the multitudes, overtly creating, implementing, and enforcing 'man-made laws and rules' under the disguise of being 'God's laws and rules'. So we must remember that 'any image or likeness of Jesus, God, or anything perceived to be in heaven' is 'a corruptible image' because of the lies that are spoken by vain false prophets and false teachers about God from behind those images and likenesses. 'Any image or likeness of Jesus, God, or anything perceived to be in heaven' is 'a corruptible image' because vain false prophets and false teachers will 'speak for images and likenesses', saying that 'it was God who spoke' (see Jeremiah 23.31), essentially breathing **false life** into those images and likenesses.

All images (implied false images) of God, Jesus, or of any god (i.e., the Eucharist) are <u>without the breath of God's Spirit</u>. It is men, false prophets, who <u>breathe false life</u> into those images by 'speaking for the <u>images'</u>. I.e., the images are dead and <u>simply cannot speak for themselves</u>. As <u>simple</u> and as <u>basic</u> as that sounds, this concept has been obscured in people's minds because 'false Catholic prophets' have <u>taught</u> the multitudes the <u>total opposite</u> - for almost 2 millennia - from behind 'the <u>breathless</u>

<u>Eucharist'</u>. To satisfy their own lust for supremacy, control, and power, the leaders of the Catholic Church have <u>taught people to treat the Eucharist</u>, a <u>dead inanimate object</u>, as 'being alive'. Isaiah tried to get the people of his day to understand that they too had been <u>taught these same falsehoods by false prophets</u>; see also 'the story of Daniel and the false (<u>dead</u>) idol <u>Bel</u>' in Section 3. Isaiah 46.6-7 says "They hire a <u>goldsmith</u> and <u>he makes it a god</u>. They prostrate themselves, yes they worship. They bear it on the shoulder, they carry it and set it in its place, and it stands. From its place <u>it shall not move</u>.

Though one cries out to it, yet <u>it cannot answer nor save him</u> out of his trouble." <u>If you have ever been to a Catholic benediction</u> then you have seen this <u>same</u> set of events taking place. They put the Eucharist in a stand and "set it in its place" since it cannot walk and set itself in place. "From its place it shall not move" on its own accord. And when someone "cries out to it", the Eucharist cannot speak back, so a priest must '<u>speak for it</u>'. For their own glory, the <u>false prophets</u> of Catholicism have breathed a <u>false life</u> into the Eucharist. Therefore, the Eucharist - as it simply cannot breathe, walk, talk, or 'save people from their trouble' - is **not** '<u>living bread from heaven</u>'; ultimately understanding that the <u>Living</u> Christ, who <u>walked</u> the earth 2000 years ago and had the <u>breath</u> of God's Spirit, was the only <u>true</u> '<u>living</u> bread from heaven'.

To emphasize the idea that Catholicism places a high regard on 'dead relics' and 'lifeless objects and images', consider the fact that many Catholics believe that a statue of Jesus, Mary, or a 'supposed saint', if <u>blessed</u> by a priest, must be <u>buried if it is broken</u>. In this regard, they are treating a statue, an inanimate object, as if it has a spirit; as if it is alive. They are treating a statue as if it is 'alive and breathing', and then 'somehow dead and in need of burial' if broken. But, the statue is not dead because it was simply never alive. Just like the Eucharist, it never contained 'the breath of God's Spirit', regardless if it was **blessed** or **consecrated**; which are simply words that mean 'breathing **false life** into an inanimate object'. So we must know that to treat a statue or any image - such as the Eucharist - as if it is *alive*, or *has a spirit*, is same <u>pagan mentality</u> of the Old Testament that people **today** will <u>claim</u> that they could <u>never subscribe to</u>... although they unknowingly do. In Isaiah 44.17-20, he speaks of 'a dead block of wood' that is carved into an image and then worshipped as if it were alive; as if it were the <u>Living</u> God. Isaiah says "He falls down before it and worships it, prays to it and says, '<u>Deliver me</u>, for you are my god!' (But) no one considers in his heart, nor is their knowledge, nor is their understanding to say, **'I have burned half of it in the fire**, <u>baked bread</u> and <u>roasted meat</u> on its coals. Shall I make <u>the</u> rest of it an abomination (a false idol)? Shall I fall down before a block of wood?' And so, just as Isaiah is making the point that 'idols are basically dead, inanimate blocks of wood', we must realize that <u>all statues, relics, images, and objects</u> of <u>all</u> religions - whether it is <u>truly believed</u> (as with the Eucharist) that 'the idol has a life force (i.e., spirit)', or just Venerated or treated with respect - are in fact equivalent to 'dead, inanimate blocks of wood' that have had a false life breathed into them by false prophets in the interest of then 'speaking for the idol' words that benefit the false prophet and his institution... and ultimately, yet unknowingly, Satan. Remember, if it can't breathe, walk, and talk - as the Living Christ could breathe, walk, and talk - then it is just 'a block of wood' with NO spiritual presence or life force.

Now of course we must recognize that, since the Catholic hierarchy <u>truly believes</u> that they can 'breathe a <u>life force</u> or <u>spirit</u> into a piece of bread', <u>thinking</u> that they have '<u>consecrated</u> the <u>Eucharist</u> so that it <u>contains the Spirit of Jesus'</u>, then they in fact <u>prove</u> their <u>lack of spiritual sight and <u>awareness</u></u>, not being able to recognize that their 'piece of bread' is <u>still</u> essentially just like 'the block of wood spoken of by Isaiah'. Hence, it is sadly true that even a <u>common house Cat</u> can recognize <u>whether</u> or <u>not</u> 'an image has a <u>spirit</u> or a <u>life force</u>' <u>better than</u> the Catholic hierarchy. That is, place 'an <u>image</u>, <u>statue</u>, or

picture of a cat' in front of a living cat. You will notice that, with no reaction, the living cat will 'look right through the picture' as if there is nothing there at all. Yet if you were to place 'another living cat' in front of the 1st living cat, then you can be sure that there will be quite a reaction on the part of both cats. Thus in 'matters of basic spiritual awareness and sight' - i.e., whether or not something has a spirit or 'is alive' - it seems as though common house cats have more knowledge than the <u>Catholic hierarchy</u>, with Catholic priests allowing <u>warped</u> inherited lies to <u>**override**</u> their 'God-given instinct and common sense' so that they blindly treat a dead idol as if it were alive. Therefore we must know - as our *common sense*, not to mention our *common house cats*, tell us as much - that the Catholic Church, by worshipping the Eucharist, is very much WOrShiping a dead idol, equivalent to any other 'dead image, statue, block of wood, etc.' that is without a spirit or life force, with this dead idol being, at best, *dead flesh*, not the *Living Jesus* or 'living bread from heaven'; remembering that even Jesus Himself said that 'His flesh will bring us no spiritual profit' (John 6.63), as it is merely something that 'goes into your stomach, not your heart'. And as much as the Catholic hierarchy thinks that they truly have the ability (through consecrating, blessing, and various other forms of normalized sorcery) to 'breathe the Spirit of Christ into an inanimate piece of bread' which then (supposedly) becomes 'living bread that must be worshipped', the fact is that they are blindly just 'worshipping the dead works of their own hands which their own fingers (not the Holy Spirit) have made' (Isaiah 2.8)... and even condemning 'those who don't follow them in their blind, blatant acts of idolatry' to eternal damnation.

What 'dead image' or 'dead piece of flesh' could do justice to an unfathomable Living God? What image could describe an indescribable God? What picture could be drawn, or statue carved, that would not be an insult to a Being that has created more stars than humans can even count? That is why 'Man lives on every word that God speaks' and not 'on every image or statue that man makes'. These are all corruptible items used by men to oppress and control God's people. Examine most any book in the Old Testament. Any time an image, carving, or statue is mentioned, it is an utter insult and abomination to God. Yet somehow - according to the doctrine of Catholicism - God changed from the Old Testament to the New Testament. Are we to believe that, right before Jesus sealed the New Covenant with His blood, He instructed His Apostles to make and worship an image of Him, knowing that every image of God up until this point constituted blatant idolatry? John 1.1 says "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God". If Jesus was the Word, and He was the Word from the beginning, would Jesus not be breaking the very Law that He gave to Moses by telling His Apostles to make and worship an image of Himself? As Malachi 3.6 says "For I am the Lord, I do not change", with the next verse (7) clarifying that it is God's ordinances (in particular the Primary Commandment) or <u>Law</u> that 'does not change'. So as much as Catholicism's ever-changing doctrine - i.e., 'the law of Satan' - sounds like 'the Law of God', it is 'worlds away' from the actual unchanging Law of God. Satan has twisted the word of God from the beginning in order to 'disguise his law as God's Law'. I.e., Satan disguised his 'false knowledge of good and evil' as 'true knowledge of good and evil', in order trick Adam and Eve into unknowingly following his law. And Satan gets away with his lies by 'planting them right next to the truth', then saying that 'they are the truth' so that we actually think they are the truth. Therefore, to believe that 'Jesus broke His own unchanging Law, and actually instituted the worship of a

<u>dead inanimate object</u>', is to believe 'Satan's clever <u>lie</u> - i.e., the <u>ever-changing</u> law of Satan that causes confusion - which his blind ministers have planted right next to the <u>truth</u> (i.e., the <u>unchanging</u> Law of God)'. Remember, <u>as much as Satan's laws sound like the truth</u>, they are 'worlds away' from the truth.

God's word is unchanging, and He is the same God "Yesterday, today, and forever" (Hebrews 13.8). As Malachi 3.6 says "For I am the Lord, <u>I do not change</u>". People have made the mistake of thinking that there is a distinction (as if He 'changed') between 'the God of the Old Testament' and 'the God of the New Testament'. Do not make that mistake. 'The God of the Old Testament' and 'the God of the **New Testament'** are **'one in the same, unchanging God'**. Thus we must not think of the Old Testament and the New Testament as being separate books; they too are 'one in the same'. I.e., the text of the New Testament is actually just an extension of the text of the Old Testament, as Jesus continually restated what the Prophets of the Old Testament had already written. And while the Old Testament contains the 'first' or Old Covenant, the Old Testament also **CONTAINS** the writings of all the Prophets who were **describing the New Covenant**. So we must recognize that, since some people (such as the Catholic hierarchy) use the names 'New Testament' and 'New Covenant' interchangeably, our perception of the Old Testament has been skewed and confused in our minds. I.e., the text of the New Testament speaks about the New Covenant, but the text of the Old Testament also speaks of the New Covenant, making it incorrect and misleading to say that 'the New Testament' = 'the New Covenant'. By saying that 'the New Testament' = 'the New Covenant', the importance and relevancy of the Old Testament - as in the Old Testament's overwhelming content pertaining to idolatry - is downplayed; as if idolatry no longer exists with the sealing of the New Covenant. But idolatry is more rampant than ever, being disguised with the names of our religions. So the name barrier that has been placed in our minds, which was no doubt perpetuated by the Catholic Forefathers, *paints* the Old Testament as being <u>outdated</u> and somewhat <u>irrelevant</u>, when the truth is that much of the Old Testament - which contains the New Covenant written by Jeremiah (31.31-34) in 600 BC - is just as fresh and relevant today as it was when it was written. And since the Old Testament teachings about 'false prophets, idolatry, and a New Covenant to eliminate false prophets and idolatry' have essentially been ignored for over 2500 years, the underlying message that the Old Testament Prophets were trying to convey with the New Covenant is actually more progressive than ever. Therefore, because we have a name barrier in our minds - thinking that the Old Testament is outdated and irrelevant - Catholicism has been able to easily deceive us into believing that 'the idolatry that ran rampant in the Old Testament was **forever destroyed** with the sealing of the New Covenant and the start of the Roman Catholic religion'.

But in actuality Roman Catholicism has done *far worse* than anyone in the Old Testament by 'teaching us' that *it is right* to totally disregard the 1st Commandment with 'the worship of a false image of the Son of God'; which is also breaking the New Covenant. Remember, the New Covenant states that 'no one shall teach his neighbor about God' (see Section 2). By 'stealing the name of Jesus and speaking vainly in His name', Satan and Catholicism have deceived the multitudes into unknowingly worshiping their false idol and false god. As if to say 'the Old Testament and the God of the Old Testament are null

and void', Satan and Catholicism have, in the name of Jesus, taught us that it is actually right to worship 'their false idol and false god', 'the Eucharist and Catholicism'. Thus by deceptively naming their false idol 'Jesus' - remembering that names are utterly deceiving - and speaking lies from behind that false idol, the Catholic Church has easily been able to teach us 'the law of Satan' as if it were 'the Law of God'. But we must remember that Roman Catholicism has simply named 'their golden calf' 'Jesus'. The only difference is that, in our present day, 'a piece of bread with the name of Jesus attached to it' is a lot harder to identify as being a false idol than 'an actual golden calf'; remembering of course that Satan attached 'the name of God' to the Israelite's golden calf (Exodus 32.8) in order to make it 'hard to identify as being a false idol', and hence believable in the Israelite's own day. Therefore, we must recognize that the Eucharist, regardless if it has 'the name of Jesus' attached to it, is a false Jesus that Satan has simply made believable in our own day in order to cause - in the name of Jesus - senseless 'division, war, and hate'. We must recognize that the Eucharist, regardless if it has 'the name of Jesus' attached to it, is the work of Satan and a blatant violation of God's Primary Commandment to 'not make, serve, or 'bow down to' any image or likeness of anything that is in heaven or on earth'.

8. The Eucharist: Cornerstone of the Catholic Church's Wall of Lies

Hypnosis is 'an induced state that <u>resembles sleep</u> in which the subject is <u>responsive</u> to the <u>suggestions</u> of the <u>inducer</u>'. If <u>Satan</u> can be considered '<u>the inducer</u>', then 'hypnotized' describes the state of <u>all</u> religious entities, being asleep or under a spell, and thereby blindly and unknowingly responding to Satan's suggestions. As Isaiah 29.10 says, "For the Lord has poured out on you the spirit of deep sleep". In the case of Catholicism (as well as Christianity as a whole), Satan has hypnotized them by the <u>repetition</u> of <u>saying Jesus' name over and over again</u>. Thus they are responsive to the inducer, Satan, when he makes suggestions 'in the name of Jesus'; noting that Islam is responsive to suggestions made 'in the name of Muhammad', and so on. Satan says 'the name of Jesus' and then attaches his evil agenda to Jesus' name. By doing this, Satan has essentially 'traded wrong for right' through name association. As Philip says, "(Satan) assumes the names (and identities) of 'the good' and assigns to them what is evil to fool people with names" (Gospel of Philip 54,18-31). Or, Satan takes something that is evil, and then associates it with a *good name* so that people accept it as good; thus *redefining good and evil*. Words and names are utterly deceiving. And by naming the Eucharist 'Jesus' and speaking flattering words of divinity from behind the Eucharist - or from behind any other name such as Buddha or Muhammad - the whole world has been utterly deceived and hypnotized by Satan. As 1 John 5.19 says "The whole world lies under the sway of the Wicked One". Thus with flattering words and names that are associated with divinity (i.e., Jesus, God, and the Prophets) we have become hypnotized; responsive to the suggestions of 'the inducer' (Satan) as if asleep or under a spell.

By reading the book of **Hebrews**, it becomes obvious that the Jews 2000 years ago were **also** under the spell of Satan; asleep, believing that they were doing God's will because Satan had made up lies 'in the names of Moses and Abraham' (i.e., in the name of tradition). The book of Hebrews was written to try and wake up the Jewish people and convince them that Jesus was 'the last great Sacrifice which needed to be performed'. Just like the Catholic Church - as Catholicism is merely a continuation of what Judaism was 2000 years ago - they had priests who offered daily sacrifices of 'a lamb which was accompanied by bread and wine offerings'. And so the book of Hebrews was trying to convey that 'Jesus was the High Priest' who "Offered one sacrifice, once and for all, when He offered Himself" (Hebrews 7.27). "For by one sacrifice, He perfected **forever** those who are being sanctified... so there is **no longer** an offering for sin" (Hebrews 10.14-18). Jesus' sacrifice was supposed to forever free us from the bonds of men, yet men have deceptively named their false idol 'Jesus' sacrifice' - i.e., 'the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass' - in order to 'enslave us with what was supposed to free us'. If 'there is no longer an offering needed for sin', and 'Jesus was the one sacrifice which was offered once and for all', then Why does the Catholic Church continually perform 'the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass' (i.e., the Eucharist)? Why does the Catholic Church continually perform 'the Holy <u>Sacrifice</u> of the Mass' when Jesus Himself says 'God does <u>not want</u> sacrifice, He wants kindness and mercy' (Matthew 9.13). In 'simplest terms', that is as if Jesus said with a double tongue, 'I do not want to sacrifice (No), but I want sacrifice (Yes)'. Therefore, in simplest terms, it becomes obvious that 'the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass' is the work of Satan's double mind, who has tricked the Catholic hierarchy into thinking that they can continually replicate the final sacrifice of Jesus; which by the way was a living breathing Being who was brutally and mercilessly murdered as a true

sacrifice, unlike Catholicism's false sacrifice in which 'nothing that is living, breathing, or of any significance, is physically killed'. I.e., the definition of a true sacrifice is one in which 'something living, and of some significance, is killed'. And so Catholicism's so-called holy sacrifice is not holy at all; it is actually quite defiled. It is Satan's defiled imitation of the real Jesus that he uses to secretly control the nations and keep them divided. It is 'the source of our division' and consequently 'the source of war and hate'. The Eucharist is 'the Image of the Beast' that the Catholic hierarchy has 'breathed false life into' in order to put to death, both physically and spiritually, all those who will not worship their false idol (see Section 5.2). It is truly an idol that has caused unfathomable desolation, hence the name 'Abomination of Desolation' (see Section 5.1). The book of Hebrews was written to the Jewish people to try and wake up the hypnotized Jewish priests and convince them to 'remove their daily sacrifices' because 'Jesus had offered one sacrifice that was perfect forever'. Ironically, the daily sacrifices were removed as prophesied by Daniel, but in place of the daily sacrifices, the Forefathers of Catholicism 'placed there the Abomination of Desolation'; the Eucharist, a 'false image of Christ'.

Thus by instituting 'a false image of Christ', the Catholic hierarchy and their forefathers have been able to control everything we know about Jesus and Christianity by speaking lies about Jesus from behind their 'false image of Christ'. And since Catholicism essentially controls the persona of Christ, they also control the past, keeping us ignorant of the true past. Remember, those who control the past will control the future. The ability of the Catholic hierarchy to control the past - via controlling Jesus' true persona - allowed them for many centuries to control the future; which of course ensured their continued position of authority over the multitudes. But with the advent of the Protestant Reformation which coincided with the invention of the <u>printing press</u> and the spread of 'the unfiltered word of Jesus' - Catholicism lost some of their control of the past. And so the Protestant Reformation - as Protestantism still holds to fundamental misguided teachings of Catholicism such as 'breaking the New Covenant by teaching us their own false personas of God and Jesus' - has merely been a building block that God has used as 'a means to an end'. That 'end' of course being 'the End of the Age' and 'the destruction of the temple'. And 'the destruction of <u>all</u> temples' starts with 'the destruction of Catholicism's wall of lies'. Catholicism's wall of lies is based on their control of the persona of Jesus; which is accomplished by purposefully misinterpreting the words of Christ. So in order to tear down Catholicism's wall of lies - which has taken nearly 2000 years to systematically construct - we must begin by identifying the true persona of Christ and the true intentions of His words. In order to tear down Catholicism's wall of lies - and thereby control our future - we must begin by learning the true past; not the false past that the Catholic hierarchy has spoken from behind their 'false puppet Jesus', the Eucharist.

The very core of Catholicism centers on the Eucharist; it represents their ability to <u>define</u> and <u>redefine</u> '<u>who Jesus is'</u>. Hence the <u>Eucharist</u> is 'the <u>Cornerstone</u> of Catholicism's wall of lies'. So in order to <u>tear down</u> Catholicism's enormous and mysterious wall of lies, <u>we must remove the</u> <u>Cornerstone</u>; <u>we must remove the Eucharist</u>. Catholicism's enormous and mysterious wall of lies <u>looms</u> over humanity, keeping us all in darkness. Therefore, to control our future, and ensure <u>true</u> <u>world peace</u> and <u>light</u>, we must remove the cornerstone of Catholicism's wall of lies; we must <u>remove</u>

and destroy the Eucharist. Once it has been removed, Catholicism's entire wall of lies will come <u>crashing</u> down and the <u>true light</u> of God will finally shine through. Thus it is important to remind Pope Francis of his own words; "Bring down all the Walls that divide the world". If Pope Francis has <u>true humility</u>, he will 'practice what he preaches' by removing and destroying 'the source of our division' and 'the <u>cornerstone</u> of Catholicism's wall of lies': the <u>Eucharist</u>.

One of the reasons that the Eucharist has remained intact as 'the <u>cornerstone</u> of Catholicism's wall of lies' is 'the belief in the <u>Eucharistic Miracles</u>'. If Catholics do believe in the Eucharistic Miracles, then they should <u>stop</u> believing, as they are merely believing in <u>false miracles</u> that Satan has used to <u>deceive</u> the whole world (Revelation 12.9, 13.8, and 18.23). Concerning these false miracles or 'great signs' by the Catholic hierarchy (who are of course Satan's blind puppets), Revelation 13.14-15 says "And he (the Pope) <u>deceives</u> those who dwell on the earth by <u>great signs</u> which he was <u>granted</u> (by Satan) to do in the sight of the Beast (the Catholic Church). He (the Pope) told those who dwell on the earth to <u>make an image</u> to the Beast. He (the Pope) was granted power to <u>give breath</u> (i.e., transubstantiation) to the <u>Image of the Beast</u> (the <u>Eucharist</u>) so that the Image of the Beast should both <u>speak</u> and cause <u>as many</u> as would <u>not worship</u> the Image of the Beast to be <u>killed</u>". Therefore Revelation makes it quite clear that the Eucharist is, at best, a false miracle or 'great sign' which the Pope and his hierarchy - being granted authority from Satan - perform in order to <u>deceive</u> God's people. Revelation makes it quite clear that the Eucharist is the Image of the Beast that is, either <u>directly</u> or <u>indirectly</u>, responsible for the death of countless millions worldwide over the last two millennia (see Section 5.2). The following explores <u>2</u> scenarios that easily explain the Eucharistic Miracles.

Scenario 1) The Eucharistic Miracles are a <u>total hoax</u> created by Catholicism for <u>publicity</u>, <u>money</u>, and <u>validation</u> of their supposed ability to perform the act of <u>transubstantiation</u>; which of course equates to **control**, **power**, and **authority**. Think about it. It is not beyond the means of a deceitful person to acquire or steal actual flesh (maybe from a morgue) and then '<u>plant'</u> the flesh in a chalice. They may not have even 'let the priest in on the hoax' in order to gain an <u>authentic performance</u> that would be <u>believable</u> to the public; and the priest himself. Ask yourself 'Why have we not seen these miracles, in today's world of cameras and the internet, as they are happening? And why have these miracles always happened under <u>mysterious</u> and <u>questionable</u> circumstances?' One of the last Eucharistic miracles (which took place in South America) occurred after a priest had left a <u>consecrated host</u> in a chalice for <u>a number of days</u>. When he came back <u>after</u> a few days, the host had 'miraculously' turned into flesh. This whole occurrence sounds less like a miracle and more like a plea for attention.

<u>Scenario 2</u>) The Eucharistic Miracles are 'actual pieces of bread that have <u>authentically</u> been <u>transformed</u> into <u>flesh</u>'. Even if an actual transformation has occurred, and even if it is <u>Jesus' real flesh</u>, the teaching of Christ still <u>totally contradicts</u> any benefit from eating His flesh. As already mentioned in <u>Section 7</u>, 'Jesus' <u>flesh is physical bread</u> that profits the soul <u>nothing</u>' (John 6.63) as 'anything that goes into your mouth, <u>does not go into your heart</u>, but goes into your stomach and is eliminated' (Matthew 15.11-19 and Mark 7.18-19). The <u>true</u> 'spiritual bread from heaven' is 'the <u>word</u> of God'. Jesus' flesh is irrelevant; His teaching (or His <u>word</u>) is 'what is relevant'. To 'worship the Eucharist' is to 'worship <u>dead</u> flesh or a <u>dead</u> idol which does not contain the spirit of Jesus'. I.e., the Eucharist cannot breathe, walk,

or talk, and so is not Jesus: 'the living bread from heaven'. The Eucharist is a false Jesus ('false living bread') that cannot save you, as only 'the words of the true living bread' can save you. And by worshiping the Eucharist, salvation is actually hindered through the creation of supremacy and exclusion that impedes the true worship of God: simply 'loving others as yourself'. Remember that 'the spirits of demons can perform great signs with which they deceive those who worship the Eucharist' (Revelation 16.13-14 & 19.20); meaning that people who worship the Eucharist and believe in the Beast's Eucharistic Miracles, are tricked into *sinning* while thinking that they are *innocent*. Jesus Himself even tells us in Matthew 24.23-25, "Then if anyone says to you, 'Look, here is the Christ!' or 'There (is the Christ)!' Do not believe it. For false christs and false prophets will rise and show great signs and wonders to deceive, if possible, even the elect. See, I have told you beforehand." Thus, as foretold by Jesus, Satan and his angels have the ability to empower false prophets so that they deceive 'even the elect' with false miracles such as the Eucharistic Miracles. And regardless of Jesus saying in Matthew 24.35 (10 verses later) "Heaven and earth will pass away, but My words will by no means pass away", we have made the mistake of thinking that His words are dead, and that the Catholic Church's words have somehow *superseded* or *outlasted* the <u>words</u> of Jesus. Jesus' <u>words</u> are very much <u>still</u> alive, and the Eucharistic Miracles are 'the great signs and wonders that have deceived us', just as Jesus foretold of in Matthew 24.23-25. They have said "Look, here is the Christ!", and we have foolishly gone against the warning of Jesus and believed them. As Revelation 13.8 and 13.14-15 says, 'All who dwell on the earth will be **deceived** by the Image of Catholicism: the **Eucharist**'.

Realizing that the Eucharist could be 'the Image of the Beast that deceives the whole world', should Catholics not begin to ask themselves 'Why do I believe and blindly defend 'supposed Saints' (Forefathers) of the Catholic Church whom <u>I have **never met**</u>? Why should I stand behind 'people that the Catholic Church claims are in heaven', yet no one really knows who is in heaven?' Catholics need to realize that the Catholic hierarchy controls the past by making us think that everyone associated with their institution is 'of God'. Catholics need to realize that the Catholic hierarchy has associated their Forefathers with names of past righteousness - such as Jesus and the true Prophets - in order to get the multitudes to follow them as if they (the multitudes) are following Jesus Himself. But we must remember that we have never met any of the Catholic Forefathers, and thus are blindly believing <u>Catholicism's 'spin' on history</u>; which of course 'paints a portrait of their false prophets as actually being true Prophets'. If St. Augustine and St. Jerome were alive today, would we believe them? These men have become untouchable because they lived 1600 years ago and have been given the title of 'Saint'. But if they lived in today's literate world - remember that in their time (around 400 AD) they were the only ones who could read Scripture because of either literacy, translations, or simply exclusive access to Scripture - these men and their false interpretations of Scripture would be 'laughed at' because of 'the dictator-like <u>authoritarianism</u>' that they implied should belong to the Catholic hierarchy. I.e., 'there is no salvation without the Catholic hierarchy'. Therefore we must realize that these men of early Catholicism are considered 'Saints' only because the Catholic Church still stands today. If the Catholic Church would've fallen long ago, these same people we call 'Saints' today would actually be considered heretics because of the false doctrine that they handed down to future generations. But Catholicism does still stand, and the future generation that has ultimately 'inherited the lies started by the Catholic

Forefathers' is <u>us</u>. As Jeremiah 16.19 says "Surely our fathers have inherited lies". And if 'our fathers have inherited lies', then 'surely we have <u>also</u> inherited those <u>same</u> lies'. Thus we should no longer <u>blindly</u> 'defend, believe, and trust in' the Catholic Forefathers - men we have never met - <u>because</u> "Cursed is the man who trusts in man" (Jeremiah 17.5).

It is very dangerous to blindly 'defend, believe, and trust in' what you don't understand; or what men teach other men 'in the name of God and faith'. As Jeremiah says "Cursed is the man who trusts in man". The Catholic hierarchy actually tells us that they themselves blindly 'defend, believe, and trust in' what they don't understand; essentially admitting that they are 'blind leaders of the blind'. They tell us, 'We don't know how bread is transformed (i.e., transubstantiation) into the actual true presence of Jesus. It is a mystery of our faith.' And if you don't follow them in their unwavering blind belief in the traditions of their forefathers, then they tell you that 'you don't have enough faith'. They belittle you by making you think that you are 'the one of little faith', when it is really they who are leading you blindly, trying to make you 'blindly believe and have faith in the lies of Satan'. And so the Catholic hierarchy mistakes 'blindly believing in a lie' as 'faith'. They throw out all logic and reason and then call it faith. But it is **not** faith; it is simply ignorance. Therefore, **blind faith** is **not faith** at all, it is simply ignorance. God's New Covenant placed in our hearts and minds the same logic and reason that the Catholic hierarchy discards in hopes of finding true faith. But true faith utilizes our God-given logic and reason, and it is Satan's clever lie that makes the Catholic hierarchy actually oppose what God has placed in our hearts and minds. The Catholic hierarchy must ask themselves 'Is our logic and reason from God or from Satan?'... obviously God. And so it is Satan who wants us to discard our God-given logic and reason so that we blindly believe his lies, thinking that by doing so we have attained true faith. Therefore, **true faith** is based on **true knowledge** that is backed by the logic and reason of the true words and intentions of Christ. And because 'the Catholic faith' is based on 'the ignorance of Jesus' true words and intentions', it does not represent true knowledge or truth faith, but simply ignorance. As Philip (83,30-84,14) said "Ignorance is the mother of all evil". If you remain ignorant of Christ's true intentions, then men who peddle the lies of Satan can easily enslave you. Thus 'knowledge is **freedom, and ignorance is slavery'**. And if we continue to follow 'the Catholic faith', thinking that they represent true knowledge, then we will continue to be 'ignorant and enslaved', thinking that 'their **enslavement** is the **freedom** of Christ'.

Think about it. If you admit that you do not understand what you are following, or 'it's a mystery', is it not possible that you are unknowingly following Satan? Satan has cleverly disguised 'the <u>ignorance</u> of not understanding what you are following' with flattering words. He has convinced us to <u>rename blind</u> ignorance and blind understanding as 'a Divine Mystery of Faith'. And once we have named something 'a Divine Mystery of Faith' (i.e., the act of transubstantiation), it becomes <u>unquestionable</u>; we have placed it in 'the realm of divinity'. Satan knows that once something is placed in <u>the realm of divinity</u> by flattering words, it becomes a <u>stronghold of misunderstanding and ignorance</u> that cannot be broken. <u>Satan knows that, in order to break his stronghold, people will be accused of going against God</u>. Remember that the Pharisees and Teachers of the Law <u>accused</u>

<u>Jesus of being against God</u> because He came to **break their stronghold** of man-made teachings. Knowledge is freedom, and ignorance is slavery. In order to keep us enslaved <u>Satan will disguise 'his ignorance' as 'God's truth and knowledge'</u> by using **untouchable words** and **names of divinity**.

Therefore we must remember that words and names are utterly deceiving, and Satan uses them to keep us ignorant and enslaved.

With untouchable words and names of divinity - specifically the words and name of Jesus - and by speaking those words and names of divinity *from behind* a <u>false image</u> of Jesus, the Catholic hierarchy has <u>hypnotized</u> the Catholic people. The Catholic hierarchy speaks the name of Jesus <u>over and over again</u>, while holding up an '<u>imposter Jesus'</u>, so that the Catholic people are <u>responsive</u> to their <u>inducers</u>; as the Catholic hierarchy are merely '<u>puppet inducers'</u> for Satan. And so the Catholic hierarchy, <u>when they hold up their 'imposter Jesus'</u> at <u>communion</u>, has indeed <u>brainwashed</u> and <u>hypnotized</u> Catholics into saying '<u>1 believe'</u>'. The Catholic hierarchy holds up their 'imposter Jesus' at <u>communion</u>, saying 'Look, here is the Christ!', 'You <u>must</u> believe', while Jesus has already told us '<u>beforehand</u>', "Do not believe it" (Matthew 24.23-25). Jesus clearly told us 'beforehand' not to believe false prophets who speak His name and claim to 'have the Christ'. Therefore, how can Catholics go to <u>communion</u> and say 'I believe', when it blatantly <u>opposes</u> and <u>contradicts</u> the teaching of Jesus? Are we to believe that Christ made a <u>special exception</u> for the Catholic Church that He <u>forgot</u> to tell us about? Are not His words in Matthew 24.23 "If <u>anyone</u> says to you 'Look, here is the Christ!', <u>do not believe it</u>"? 'Anyone' surely includes the Catholic hierarchy. Yet they have of course 'omitted themselves from this teaching in order to exalt themselves', forgetting that 'those who exalt themselves will be <u>humbled</u>' (Luke 14.11).

And so Catholics are told to 'practice their faith' every week in Mass by 'seeing the Eucharist', and then saying 'I believe that the Eucharist is truly the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ'. John 20.25 says "Unless I (**Thomas**) **see** the scars of the nails in His hands, and put my finger on those scars and my hand in His side, I will **not** believe". After Jesus appears to Thomas, and Thomas comes in contact with 'Jesus in the flesh', only then does he believe. In verse 29 Jesus goes on to say "Thomas, because you have <u>seen</u> <u>Me</u>, you have <u>believed</u>. <u>Blessed are those who believe without seeing Me</u>!" So Catholics must now ask themselves, 'If Jesus knew that He had (according to Catholic doctrine) already instituted the Eucharist - which is His body, blood, soul, and divinity - then why would He say 'Blessed are those who **believe without seeing** Me', being **fully aware** that people would in fact **see Him** every week in Mass?' This makes absolutely no sense, and is again a contradiction from the double mind of Satan. Think about it. If the Eucharist had truly been instituted by Christ at the Last Supper, and the Eucharist was truly the cornerstone of Christ's newly founded church, Jesus would have said (remembering that John 20.29 is after the Last Supper and the resurrection), 'Thomas, because you have seen Me in the flesh, you have believed. Therefore you must remember that every week in Mass I will appear to the multitudes - not 'in the flesh' but as 'a piece of bread' - so that **they too** may **see** and believe.' But the fact is that Christ was basically telling us that 'people would not see Him' and that 'their faith would be increased by **believing** in Him **without seeing** Him'; which is the **total opposite** of Catholicism's idea of '<u>seeing Jesus every week in Mass</u>, just as Doubting Thomas, and then saying 'I believe''. Thus, by the Catholic hierarchy's blatant misinterpretations of Scripture that led to the creation of the Eucharist,

they have in fact <u>contradicted</u> the teaching of Jesus in John 20.29, and have thereby <u>created a multitude</u> <u>of **Doubting Thomases**</u>; having to <u>see</u> in order to <u>believe</u>. Although, because the multitude is hypnotized, they can't perceive that they are indeed *'seeing and believing in a <u>false idol'</u>*; **not** the real, living breathing Jesus as Thomas encountered 2000 years ago.

Hence we must identify the <u>main scriptural verse</u> that Catholicism <u>misinterpreted</u>, thereby giving rise to the <u>creation</u> of the <u>Eucharist</u>. In other words, what main spiritual verse does Catholicism <u>quote</u>, then <u>misinterpret</u> as 'granting them the authority to breathe life (Revelation 13.15) into the Eucharist'; or what scriptural verse grants the Catholic hierarchy <u>their perceived</u> power of <u>transubstantiation</u>.

Remember, if Satan was going to create a false idol, he would <u>not</u> introduce another 'golden calf'; that has already been done and would be 'too easy to spot'. I.e., Satan knows Scripture, and therefore knows that <u>the golden calf</u> has <u>already been identified</u> as a being <u>false idol</u>. And so to create the Eucharist, Satan took <u>words</u> right out of the mouth of Jesus in order to create a <u>hidden</u> and <u>disquised false idol</u>; one that would <u>appear</u> as though Jesus Himself created it. Knowing that the <u>best lies</u> are <u>the ones closest</u> to the truth, and the <u>boldest lies</u> are <u>the ones in plain sight</u>, Satan made it seem like Jesus Himself created 'a <u>real</u> idol' (as if there was such a thing), so that we would be <u>blind</u> to his <u>false</u> idol. Satan tells the most vile, sadistic, and wicked lies by merely changing the intention of the words written in Scripture; thus telling a lie so close to the truth that we think it's the truth. Therefore we must <u>identify 'which gospel verse Jesus spoke'</u> that the Catholic Forefathers then 'changed the intention of' in order to tell a lie that appeared 'on the surface' to be the truth.

"Do this in remembrance of Me" (Luke 22.19) is the one Scriptural line in the entire New Testament that the Catholic Church uses to justify their power of transubstantiation. Believe it or not, the entire Catholic religion hinges on this one line. It is interesting to note that the line "Do this in remembrance of Me" only shows up in one gospel; the Gospel of Luke. Even more interesting is the fact that this line only appears in some of the transcriptions of Luke. Furthermore we know, from Luke 1.2, that his gospel is a compilation of what he was told by those who saw things from the beginning and who proclaimed the message'. Luke was not present at the Last Supper and he was given 2nd, 3rd, or even 4th hand knowledge of the Last Supper at least 50 years after the actual event. Paul does mention "Do this in remembrance of Me" in Corinthians, although he was not at the Last Supper either.

The point is that, this somewhat <u>obscure line</u> has been 'the building block' for an entire religion, yet it does not seem to be of much importance to the writers of the New Testament. <u>John, who sat next to Jesus at the Last Supper (John 13.23), does not even include the entire 'This is My body' passage at all. John wrote an entire gospel with <u>5 chapters on the Last Supper</u>, 3 epistles that we know of, and the book of Revelation. Are we to believe that John, 'the Disciple that Jesus loved', <u>totally forgot</u> 'the <u>cornerstone teaching</u> of Jesus' supposed new church'? Also, why did Paul, the most prolific writer in the New Testament, barely mention the Last Supper, when he covered everything else down to 'a woman's head covering'? For the time being, let's assume that these words <u>were actually spoken</u> to explore their <u>original intended meaning</u>; which for nearly 2 millennia has been obscured by the Catholic Church's false</u>

interpretations. The following is a combination from **Luke 22.19-20** and **Matthew 26.26-29** to try and include all that was said at the **Last Supper**; which by the way took place during **'the Feast of Unleavened** <u>Bread'</u>.

"And He (Jesus) took <u>bread</u>, gave thanks and <u>broke it</u>, and gave it to them, saying, 'Take, eat; <u>this is My body</u> which is given for you. <u>Do this in remembrance of Me'</u>. Likewise He also took the cup after supper, saying, 'Drink from it, all of you. This cup is the <u>New Covenant</u> in <u>My blood</u>, which is shed for you (or many people) for the remission of sins. But I say to you, <u>I will not drink of this wine</u> from now on until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's kingdom".

<u>That's it</u>; that's all that is written in the gospels surrounding 'the bread and wine of the Last Supper'. So what were Jesus' true intentions for this passage? In order to correctly interpret what Jesus intended by saying 'This loaf of bread is My body' and "Do this in remembrance of Me", we must first understand that 'the loaf of bread' has <u>double meaning</u>; with <u>both meanings</u> of course being <u>symbolic</u> in nature, as Jesus spoke almost exclusively in parables and figurative language. Also, each symbolic meaning has different implications for 'a <u>whole</u> loaf' and 'a <u>broken</u> loaf'. The <u>2 symbolic meanings</u> are as follows.

The <u>first</u> and <u>more obvious meaning</u> is that 'the <u>whole</u> loaf of bread' <u>symbolizes</u> (<u>not</u> 'is') 'the <u>whole</u> physical body of Jesus before the crucifixion'. And by breaking the whole loaf of bread, Jesus was foreshadowing and foretelling of His own death to the Apostles, who still did not grasp or understand (see Luke 9.45 and 18.34) that Jesus was actually going to be put to death. Therefore 'the broken loaf of bread' symbolizes (not 'is') 'the broken physical body of Jesus after the crucifixion'. And once we know this 'symbolic equation', we can now easily deduce that "Do this in remembrance of Me" = 'When you break bread, remember how My body was broken for you'. Note here that, to 'remember Jesus' whether it was 'how His body was broken' or 'any other aspect of His life, death, and resurrection' - is totally worthless in today's world, as Catholicism has changed the true persona, true knowledge, and true intentions of Christ so that, in actuality, we are 'remembering the composite persona, knowledge, and intentions of the **Catholic Forefathers'**; which they have so deviously disguised as 'remembering Jesus'. Therefore, Catholicism's warped and vile definition of 'remembering Jesus' actually translates to 'remembering or worshiping Man and Satan', not 'remembering Jesus or God', with us ultimately realizing that the **Only people** capable of 'truly remembering Jesus' were the people who personally knew Him while He dwelt among us 2000 years ago. That is, regardless of whether or not someone is 'remembering that Jesus' body was <u>broken</u> for them', they <u>still</u> can't really 'remember who Jesus was', as you can't remember Someone you never knew.

The <u>Second</u> and <u>less obvious (or *hidden*) meaning</u> is that 'the <u>whole</u> loaf of bread' <u>symbolizes</u> (<u>not</u> 'is') 'the <u>whole</u> body of believers <u>while</u> Jesus was physically present'; where 'the whole body' = 'Jesus + the multitudes of people', or 'the Bridegroom + the bride'. And by breaking the whole loaf of bread, Jesus

was <u>foreshadowing</u> and <u>foretelling</u> that His **true** body of believers - which is <u>not</u> based on any religious affiliation that we are familiar with today - would be <u>scattered</u> and <u>broken Until He returns</u> at 'the End of the Age'. I.e., <u>immediately</u> after breaking bread, Jesus says "For it is written: 'I will strike the Shepherd, and <u>the sheep of the flock</u> will be <u>scattered</u>" (Matthew 26.31). Therefore 'the <u>broken</u> loaf of bread' <u>symbolizes</u> (<u>not</u> 'is') 'the <u>broken</u> body (i.e., flock) of believers <u>after</u> Jesus physically departed'. And, as discussed in <u>Section 2</u>, we must remember that, as 'Christ's literal body' (i.e., His actual living, breathing body) <u>feels</u> what His 'body of people' feel, then <u>both</u> 'bodies' are used somewhat <u>interchangeably</u>, <u>both</u> being <u>broken</u> in pieces (just like the loaf of bread) until Christ returns for 'the <u>marriage</u> of the Lamb', when Christ and His body or '<u>bride</u>' become one <u>whole</u> flesh; just as one <u>whole</u> loaf of bread.

The <u>second</u> symbolic meaning of 'the loaf of bread' will be discussed after proving the <u>first</u> symbolic meaning of 'the loaf of bread'. To do that we must examine the line "Do this in remembrance of Me" in order to prove that Catholicism's <u>assertion</u>, which states that "Do this in remembrance of Me" grants them the power of transubstantiation', is in fact a fabrication of their own warped logic and reason, and a product of their blind lust for control and power over Jesus' bride. Thus, in <u>proving</u> the <u>first</u> symbolic meaning of 'the loaf of bread', it is of utmost importance to in fact <u>disprove</u> that "Do this in remembrance of Me" grants Catholicism the ability to <u>transform</u> 'the whole loaf of bread' into Jesus, because it is this 'supposed ability of transubstantiation' that is the <u>single greatest Source</u> of their unrighteous mental control over the multitudes.

In terms of <u>disproving</u> Catholicism's assertion that Jesus granted them the power of transubstantiation with the one line "Do this in remembrance of Me", it helps to <u>break the line apart</u> to determine which <u>half</u> of the line is of <u>most importance</u>. And so the 1st half of the line = "<u>Do this</u>", and the 2nd half of the line = "<u>in remembrance of Me</u>". Since the meaning of the <u>2nd half</u> of the line, "in remembrance of Me", is <u>dictated</u> by the meaning of the <u>1st half</u>, "Do this", then it is the 1st half of the line, "Do this", that '<u>controls'</u> the meaning of the <u>entire line</u>. For example, if you replace "Do this" with <u>2 different scenarios</u>, it becomes obvious that the 1st half of the line in fact <u>controls</u> the entire line. Scenario 1; 'Jump off a bridge in remembrance of Me'. And scenario 2; 'Jump up-and-down in remembrance of Me'. So both of these scenarios are done 'in remembrance of Me', yet scenario 1 could <u>prove fatal</u>, while scenario 2 could <u>improve your health</u>. Therefore, by these 2 examples, with 2 totally different outcomes, it becomes quite clear that <u>the fragment "Do this" is the controlling half of the line</u>, and is 'what must be scrutinized' in order to determine what '<u>this'</u> we are going to '<u>Do'</u>'. I.e., "Do this" must be examined closely to determine 'a definite meaning' to a rather 'indefinite 2 words'; noting that "in remembrance of Me" has a more definite and less debated meaning.

Thus the fragment "<u>Do this</u>" is really the part of the sentence that is in question, as we could do a multitude of things '*in Jesus' memory*', but what the Catholic Church asserts we '*do'* is to 'make a false image of Jesus', thereby breaking God's Primary Commandment. And so as insignificant as it may sound, the 2 words "Do this" (and of course their false interpretations) are the main words by which Catholicism has fallen deep into <u>idolatry</u>. In fact, since the 2 words "Do this" are really the *only* words that the Catholic Church hinges their power of transubstantiation on, the **very existence of their**

<u>entire religion</u> also <u>hinges</u> on the 2 words "<u>Do this</u>". To be clear, <u>2 words</u>, which only appear <u>one</u> <u>time</u> in only <u>some</u> transcriptions of Luke - a man who was <u>not</u> at the Last Supper - constitute the <u>foundation</u> of an entire 2000-year-old institution. Nonetheless it will be <u>disproven</u> that these 2 words convey any power or authority to the Catholic hierarchy.

So are we to believe - as Catholicism asserts - that the words "Do this" mean 'Make a re-creation of Jesus' or 'Make a representation of Jesus'? Ask yourself 'If someone was not aware of the existence of the Catholic Church, nor had ever read the Bible, do you think that they would read the line "Do this in memory of Me" and make the highly subjective interpretation that "Do this" actually means to 'Make a re-creation of Jesus'?' There's not a chance in hell that someone would make that interpretation! To say that 'the bread is Jesus' or 'the bread represents Jesus' is to cross the line into idolatry by 'making an image of something that is in heaven or on earth'. The bread was meant to Symbolize 'what was going to happen to Jesus'; i.e., He would be broken. The bread was not meant to actually be Jesus. Remember, Satan tells <u>lies</u> that are 'so close to the truth that you actually think they are the truth'. So to say that 'the bread is Jesus' is to believe Satan's lie that he has placed right next to the truth and the words of Jesus. By saying that 'the bread is Jesus', we in fact create a false idol from behind which 'man' - under the unknowing influence of Satan - can speak lies about God, thereby redefining God's persona 'to suit the agenda of man'. And so, 'the broken bread' was used only to symbolically convey that 'Jesus' body would be broken'; not that 'the broken bread was actually Jesus'. Therefore, it will be proven that "Do this" simply means 'When you break bread', not 'Make a re-creation of Jesus'; keeping in mind from earlier that the entire line "Do this in remembrance of Me" = 'When you break bread, remember how My body was broken for you'.

To prove that it is <u>impossible</u> for "Do this" to mean 'Make a re-creation of Jesus', we must <u>rewrite</u> the entire line - "Do this in remembrance of Me" - with 'the <u>substituted</u> Catholic meaning' for the 2 words "Do this". It would read as follows. 'Make a re-creation of Me in remembrance of Me'. When you <u>rewrite</u> the <u>original verse</u> with the Catholic Church's intentions of "Do this" it sounds quite <u>manipulated</u>. And in fact, when you see this 'rewritten Catholic interpreted verse', it easily <u>proves</u> that the Catholic Church's interpretation is false by a simple **tense analysis**.

If you examine 'the tense of the 1st half' and 'the tense of the 2nd half' of their interpreted verse - 'Make a re-creation of Me in remembrance of Me' - you will find that the tenses do not agree; they do not make sense. Remember that, by Catholic interpretation, the Eucharist is 'the true presence of the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ'; i.e., 'being in the presence of the Eucharist' = 'being in the presence of Jesus Himself'. Therefore we must ask the simple question, 'Why do we need to remember Jesus as if He is in the past (or not present), if indeed He is present in the Eucharist? If you were sitting right in front of me - that is 'you are truly present in the present tense' - then would I need to 'remember you' as if you are in the past tense, or not present? Likewise, if Jesus is 'sitting right in front of us in the Eucharist' - 'truly present in the present tense' - then why would we need to 'remember Him' as if He is in the past tense, or not present? Therefore the tenses do not

agree; they do not make sense. How can Jesus be with us in the present tense, then in the same line be told to 'remember Him' as if He is not with us in the present tense anymore? In 'simplest terms' the Catholic hierarchy is saying with a double tongue 'Jesus is truly present (yes), but 'remember Jesus' as if He is not truly present (no)'. And so this simple 'analysis of tenses' reveals the Catholic Church's interpretation to be total nonsense, and identifies it as a contradiction or 'a double thought contained within one single thought'. Identifying the Catholic interpretation to be a contradiction or a double thought also identifies it as originating from the double-mind and double tongue of Satan. Satan is a master at stating 'two opposing thoughts in one thought' to cause confusion, chaos, and desolation. And that is exactly what he has done with this one single misinterpreted line from Scripture.

Think about it. Jesus would only say 'remember Me' if He was not going to be physically present. If Jesus was going to be physically present - i.e., if Jesus' true intentions of the Last Supper were to perpetually institute His true presence (body, blood, soul, and divinity) in the form of the Eucharist - He would have said 'Do this SO YOU don't have to remember Me'. Or, in other words, Jesus would have said, 'Create the Eucharist so that I will be physically present with you, and therefore you will not have to remember Me'. You must understand that Catholicism is asserting that Jesus essentially said - in plain language - 'Create the Eucharist so that I will be physically present with you, and also remember Me as if I am not physically present with you'; which is a complete nonsense, double minded thought. In simplest terms, the Catholic interpretation asserts that 'Jesus is like Satan' and spoke with a double tongue, saying, 'I will be truly present (yes), but think of Me (i.e., remember Me) as if I am not truly present (no)'. The bottom line is that it's either one or the other, not both. Either 'you physically live in the present and there is no need to remember you' or 'you physically lived in the past and so can only be remembered'; it's one or the other, not both. To believe that 'both exist at one instant in time' is to believe Satan's confusing, double tongue lies.

Additionally, Catholics who say 'I think of Jesus as though He is truly present in the Eucharist' are themselves unknowingly speaking with a double tongue, thereby repeating Satan's lies. They should ask themselves 'If I walked up to communion and truly encountered Jesus, would I not talk to Him and ask Him to walk with me back to my pew?' The answer is obviously 'Yes'. So then why are Catholics who believe in 'the true presence' not talking to the Eucharist, and walking with the Eucharist (that is, side-by-side) back to their pew? By saying 'I believe in the true presence', yet treating the Eucharist as if it is not truly 'Jesus in person', you are 'speaking words that don't match your actions' just as the Pharisees of Jesus' day. And so this simple example using basic logic and reasoning - i.e., our God-given logic and reason - shows how Satan gets Catholics to repeat his double tongue lies, while believing that they are thinking logically and repeating the truth.

Thus, with A) <u>simple tense analysis</u>, and B) '<u>the understanding of Satan's double thoughts</u>', it becomes quite clear that it is <u>impossible</u> for Jesus to be **truly present** in the Eucharist, and consequently <u>impossible</u> for "<u>Do this</u>" to mean '<u>Make a re-creation of Jesus</u>'. The true meaning of "<u>Do this</u>" - as Jesus was <u>simply breaking bread</u> when He said "<u>Do this in remembrance of Me</u>" - is '<u>When you break bread</u>'. It's just <u>that obvious</u>. Yet Satan's double tongue has mystified, mangled, and magnified this simple, 'obscure and unimportant line' in order to create <u>his masterpiece</u>: <u>the Eucharist</u>. And of course by

misinterpreting "Do this in remembrance of Me", Catholicism has also completely misinterpreted 'the <u>first</u> and obvious true symbolic meaning of the loaf of bread'. I.e., the <u>bread</u> was meant to <u>symbolize</u> 'what was going to happen to Jesus'; the <u>bread</u> was <u>not meant to actually be Jesus</u>.

Outside the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, the only other mention of *'This is My body'* was written by Paul in 1 Corinthians 11.17-34. Paul, who was actually an enemy of Christ before his conversion, was <u>not</u> present at the Last Supper, yet this is the teaching that he *"received from the Lord"*.

"The Lord Jesus, on the same night in which He was betrayed took bread; and when He had given thanks, He <u>broke</u> it and said, 'Take, eat; this is My body which is broken for you; do this in remembrance of Me'. In the same manner He also took the cup after supper, saying, 'This cup is the New Covenant in My blood. This do, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of Me'. For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until He comes" (1 Corinthians 11.23-26).

The most important line Paul wrote was <u>verse 26</u>: "For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until He comes". <u>The entire true meaning of "Do this in remembrance of Me"</u> is contained in this culminating sentence. And by breaking this 'culminating sentence' apart into 1st and 2nd halves, you can see how it corresponds <u>seamlessly</u> with the line "Do this in remembrance of Me". Notice that <u>Paul adds to "This is my body", the words "which is broken for you</u>", corresponding to the true interpretation stated in the very last line of the following equations.

1 st Half	2 nd Half
"Do this"	"in remembrance of Me"
=	=
"For as often as you eat this bread	"you proclaim the Lord's death
and drink this cup"	until He comes"
=	=
'When you break bread'	'remember how My body was broken for you'

If you are 'reciting a remembrance' then you are 'proclaiming'. I.e., by us 'reciting a remembrance of Jesus' death and resurrection', then we are 'proclaiming that Jesus died and rose from the dead'; of course meaning that "in remembrance of Me" corresponds with "you proclaim the Lord's death until He comes". And so just as before, the 2nd half of each of these lines - i.e., "in remembrance of Me" and the corresponding "you proclaim the Lord's death until He comes" - both have a more definite, and less debated meaning as far as granting any power or authority to the Catholic hierarchy. It is the 1st half of the line - i.e., "Do this" - that the Catholic hierarchy manipulates and purposefully misinterprets in order to extrapolate their false power of transubstantiation. Therefore we must scrutinize 'what words' Paul equates to "Do this". Because "Do this" is somewhat indefinite, it is no coincidence that the Catholic hierarchy took it upon themselves to interpret "Do this" in favor of their supremacy and authority over the multitudes. But Paul, by restating in verse 26 the meaning of "Do this in remembrance of Me", gives

us 'a definite meaning' for 'the 2 indefinite words', "Do this"; which of course A) disproves Catholicism's assertion that "Do this" means 'Make a re-creation of Jesus', and B) removes any supremacy or authority that the Catholic hierarchy has gained by misinterpreting "Do this". And so Paul's restated meaning of "Do this in remembrance of Me" in verse 26 gives "Do this" the definite meaning "For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup"; essentially 'unhinging' the very existence of Catholicism with one sentence fragment. Thus with this one verse (26), and specifically the fragment 'eat this bread', Paul makes it clear that "Do this" = 'to eat bread and drink wine'. And of course this essentially means that 'Catholicism's power to transform bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ' is a total fabrication, hoax, and a magic act that they have peddled to the multitudes as a means of gaining unrighteous control over their minds and consciences, with the ultimate motive of world domination.

Think about it. If "Do this" truly meant 'to transform bread and wine into flesh and blood', Paul would have said 'For as often as you eat this flesh and drink this blood'. 1 Corinthians 11.26 is Paul's culminating line in which he basically summarizes the meaning of the previous 3 verses of instruction. In terms of Catholic teaching, verse 26 would have been 'post consecration', meaning that Paul has already consecrated the bread and wine, thereby (supposedly) allowing the Holy Spirit to transform 'the substance of the bread and wine' into 'the true presence of Jesus' body, blood, soul, and divinity'. Paul spoke a few languages and was a highly educated Pharisee. To think that Paul would have made the mistake of referring to 'Jesus' post consecration flesh and blood' as simply 'bread and wine' is highly unlikely. In fact, Paul mentions 'eating bread' - not flesh - 2 more times in the 2 following verses (1 Corinthians 11.27-28). That is a total of 3 times 'post consecration' that Paul 'carelessly' (according to Catholic literal interpretation) refers to 'what is supposed to be flesh' as simply 'bread'. Paul even says in 1 Corinthians 11.17 "In giving these instructions"; meaning he was instructing on proper procedure. How could Paul have made the mistake - in 3 consecutive verses - of referring to 'post consecration flesh and blood' as 'bread and wine' when he knows that he is instructing on proper procedure, and that his instructions will (by Catholic interpretation) greatly affect the future existence of Catholicism? The fact is Paul did not refer to the 'bread and wine' as 'flesh and blood' because it was not (and never has been) 'flesh and blood'; it was (and always has been) simply 'bread and wine'. Thus Paul gives 'the 2 indefinite words', "Do this", 'the definite meaning' "For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup", thereby totally disproving the Catholic assertion that "Do this in remembrance of Me" grants the Catholic hierarchy the power of transubstantiation.

Eurthermore, are we to believe that, at the Last Supper, Jesus Himself made the same mistake as Paul by referring to 'post consecration blood' as simply 'wine'? In the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, Jesus' final culminating line at the Last Supper is "But I say to you, I will not drink of this wine from now on until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's kingdom". Did Jesus somehow forget that He had just transformed 'bread and wine' into 'flesh and blood'? Why would Jesus refer to 'blood' as being 'wine', post consecration? This was a decisive moment for Jesus and His Apostles. Jesus was supposedly passing on a crucial teaching that would become 'the cornerstone and the hallmark of His church'. This seems like a bad time for Jesus to make the mistake of confusing 'wine and blood'. The fate of an entire religion and countless generations is resting upon these words and Jesus 'messed them up'?

Not likely! The fact is that Jesus still referred to 'wine' <u>as</u> 'wine' because that's all it was; <u>simply wine</u>. And so "Do this in remembrance of Me" simply means 'When you drink <u>wine</u> at the fellowship meal, remember how My <u>blood</u> was <u>shed</u> for you'; <u>not</u> 'Make a re-creation of My blood in remembrance of Me', as Catholicism would assert.

Again, the most important line Paul wrote was "For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until He comes". Notice the end of the verse where Paul says "until He comes". If the Eucharist is 'the true presence of the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ', Why would we bother waiting for Jesus "until He comes"? By Catholic interpretation Jesus is already here, right? So again, the tenses do not agree, just as the tenses do not agree if "Do this in remembrance of Me" is interpreted as 'Make a re-creation of Me in remembrance of Me'. Think about it. Why would Paul say "until He comes", if he truly believed that the Eucharist was 'the true presence of the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ'? Why would Paul say 'until Christ comes', if Christ was already present in the Eucharist?

As an example, this is the same as saying 'You are presently standing right in front of me, but I will wait for you to get here at some future point in time'. That is a total nonsense statement. Why would I be waiting for you to get here if 'you are <u>already here</u> with me'? <u>Similarly</u>, why would we be waiting for Jesus to physically get here at some future point in time, if He is already physically here - 'body, blood, soul, and divinity' - with us in the present? The Catholic Church is in effect combining present and future tense while trying to say that there is no difference. Or with their twisted tongue they say 'Jesus is present (Yes), but He is not Yet here (No)'. Therefore, by breaking down Catholicism's double minded language into simplest terms, it becomes clear that their tenses do not agree or make any sense. I.e., Catholicism cannot assert that Jesus is truly present in the Eucharist, while simultaneously also 'waiting for Jesus until He comes'. And so by stating that 'he is Waiting for Jesus until He comes', Paul effectively says in one breath that 'there is no such thing as transubstantiation', and consequently 'there is no such thing as the true presence of Jesus in an inanimate loaf of bread'. Thus the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation is a double minded trick or *magic act* that has made people for generations believe that 'the <u>substance</u> or <u>essence</u> of an **inanimate loaf of bread** has actually become the essence of Christ'. But by simple tense analysis of words that have been in plain sight for nearly 2000 years, it becomes quite obvious that the Eucharist is all show, and no substance.

Recognizing that, in 1 Corinthians 11.26, Paul basically <u>debunks</u> Catholicism's belief in 'the true presence of Christ in the Eucharist', Catholicism's only way to explain this obvious tense <u>discrepancy</u> is to say with their twisted tongue that 'The Eucharist is merely Jesus' flesh which contains the essence of Jesus' soul, but we are still waiting for Jesus and Jesus' actual soul to return in person. We are still waiting for the living, breathing, walking, and talking Jesus to reappear.' And that is exactly the point that is being made. They have just identified 2 different souls of Jesus; one soul that is only the essence of Jesus' soul, and a 2nd soul that is Jesus' actual soul. They have just identified '2 different Jesuses'; one present non-breathing, inanimate false Jesus and a 2nd breathing and animated real Jesus that is to come in the future. As previously mentioned, flesh (or a body) that does not have the breath of God's Spirit is merely "dust of the ground" (Genesis 2.7) and is therefore not a living being. 'The body' is merely a vessel to

house the <u>spirit</u>; to house the <u>breath</u> of God's Spirit. Once the spirit leaves the body (i.e., the body dies), it stops breathing and the flesh of the body becomes worthless and meaningless; it returns to "dust of the ground". And so even if you had <u>the dead body of Jesus</u>, it would '<u>no longer be Jesus</u>' once 'God's breath of life' has left the 'fleshy vessel' which once housed Jesus' Spirit. I.e., **Jesus no longer resides in a lifeless body**. In other words, if it doesn't breathe, it can't be Jesus. If it doesn't breathe, it can't be <u>alive</u> and therefore can't possibly be '<u>living bread from heaven</u>'. If it doesn't breathe, it is a false Jesus. Thus by Catholicism's assertion that 'they have the non-breathing, inanimate body of Christ in the Eucharist' - a body that houses the <u>essence</u> of Christ's soul, <u>not His actual soul</u> - then Catholicism has effectively asserted that 'they have, and of course worship, a false christ'.

Think about a basic scenario where 'the living and breathing Jesus was to walk into Mass'. What would the Catholic Church do then? They would of course be forced to admit that 'their Jesus' is not 'the real Jesus' because the real Jesus would be standing right in front of them. The Catholic Church would now have to admit that their Eucharist, 'the supposed body and soul of Christ', is not the same as 'the living, breathing, walking, and talking Christ'. Their only possible explanation would be to admit that 'their Jesus' and 'the Jesus standing in front of them' are not the same Jesus; they are 'two different Jesuses'. Their only possible explanation would be to admit that 'their non-breathing Jesus' - the Eucharist - is not the same 'breathing Jesus' that they were waiting for "until He comes". Catholicism's only possible explanation would be to admit that 'their Jesus (the Eucharist) is a false Jesus', and without even realizing it, they have been following Satan who has disguised himself as Jesus in the Eucharist.

Thus by <u>A)</u> analyzing <u>tense</u> in 2 different verses (Luke 22.19 and 1 Corinthians 11.26), <u>B)</u> establishing that Luke 22.19 and 1 Corinthians 11.26 are in fact <u>equivalent verses</u> in meaning, <u>C)</u> recognizing that both Paul and Jesus referred to 'post consecrated supposed flesh and blood' as simply 'bread and wine', and <u>D)</u> understanding the basic and fundamental <u>difference</u> between 'an inanimate non-breathing loaf of bread' and 'an animated breathing Being', it is easily proved that Jesus used 'a broken loaf of bread' to symbolize and foreshadow that 'His body would be broken'. I.e., these things prove 'the <u>first</u> and obvious true symbolic meaning of the loaf of bread' mentioned earlier. And so by identifying this purely symbolic nature of the loaf of bread, we can conclude that Catholicism's assertion - that "Do this in remembrance of Me" grants them the unique ability to produce the <u>actual presence</u> of Christ (body, blood, soul, and divinity) - is a <u>lie</u> that is nothing short of normalized magic, witchcraft, and sorcery, which has been spoken in the name of Christ to 'deceive even the elect'. This <u>ends</u> the analysis of 'the <u>first</u> and obvious true symbolic meaning of the loaf of bread'. 'The <u>second</u> and less obvious true symbolic meaning of the loaf of bread' is as follows.

As already mentioned, the <u>second</u> and less obvious (or hidden) meaning is that 'the whole loaf of bread' <u>symbolizes</u> 'the whole body of believers'; with 'the whole body' being 'Jesus + the multitudes of people' or 'the Bridegroom + the bride'. This is the meaning for 'body' that Catholicism <u>dissociates</u> with 'This is My body', because, if they were to interpret 'body' as <u>symbolically</u> meaning 'a body of people', then they must <u>also concede</u> that 'body' as used at the Last Supper would likewise be <u>symbolic of Jesus'</u> <u>physical body</u>; or figuratively His body, <u>not</u> literally His body. I.e., while the Catholic hierarchy would surely agree that 1 Corinthians 10.17 - 'Just as we eat from <u>one loaf of bread</u>, we are also <u>one body</u>' - is

clearly stating that 'one loaf of bread' symbolizes 'one body of people', directly associating the symbolic nature of 1 Corinthians 10.17 with Christ's intentions at the Last Supper would mean that 'the idea of transubstantiation never existed'. And so the Catholic hierarchy will assert that 'Paul was attempting to explain, with one loaf of bread, the unifying effect caused by everyone eating the flesh of Christ, but Paul was in no way implying that Christ Himself was speaking symbolically or figuratively concerning the loaf of bread itself'. But of course this line of reasoning is expected, as the Catholic hierarchy is totally unaware that Jesus had been speaking symbolically about 'His body' from the time that He started teaching publicly.

As already explained in the <u>Section 2</u>, Jesus symbolizes 'His whole body of people' using 'a human body' (Matthew 5.27-30) so that He can liken 'the false prophets or false husbands' to 'an eye or a hand' that is lusting after Jesus' bride, and thereby corrupting and misleading His whole body (i.e., the Bridegroom + the bride). Likewise, in Matthew 6.22-23 and Luke 11 .33-36, Jesus likens Himself to 'a good Eye' that brings light into 'His body of believers', and likens 'the <u>blind</u> religious leaders' (i.e., the false prophets and false husbands) to 'blind bad eyes' that keep 'His body of people' in <u>darkness</u> because the people believe the <u>lies</u> of the religious leaders. Therefore, for Jesus to <u>symbolize</u> 'His whole body of believers' with 'a whole loaf of bread' is nothing new, as Jesus had - from day one - already been <u>symbolizing</u> 'His whole body of believers' with 'an actual human body'; noting that the religious leaders were symbolized as 'bad body parts' that needed to be <u>discarded</u> from His body. And for Jesus to say that 'His whole body of believers would be <u>broken</u> by the religious leaders' - just as the loaf of bread was <u>broken</u> - was nothing new, as Jesus had been saying from day one that the religious leaders were 'leading His body into hell' (Matthew 5.30) and were 'keeping His body in darkness' (Luke 11.34). Thus from day one, Jesus was essentially using the <u>figurative language</u> 'This is My body'; where 'body' <u>symbolized</u> 'Jesus' whole body of people', <u>not</u> His actual body (in this <u>context</u> of course).

Hence, we must ask the question, 'Why is Jesus using the figurative language of His body? And where does this figurative language originate?' If you read Matthew 19.3-10 where Jesus speaks concerning adultery - which is referring to 'the adultery between man and God', not 'between man and woman' you will notice that Jesus is quoting (Genesis 2.24) from the story of Adam and Eve. In Genesis 2.21-24 Moses says 'God put Adam to sleep, removed one of his rib bones, and made Eve from the rib bone. Then Adam said, 'Eve is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh'. Therefore a man shall leave his father and mother, and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh.' This is where Jesus gets His symbolism of 'one body'. Genesis 2.21-24 is stating that Adam and Eve were one body; i.e., 'bone of my bone, and flesh of my flesh'. Additionally, this also shows the origin of Jesus' figurative language where He refers to 'Himself as the Bridegroom' and to 'us as the bride'. Just as 'Adam' = 'the bridegroom' and 'Eve' = 'the bride', and together they become 'one flesh' or 'one body', Jesus (the Bridegroom) + us (the bride) = **one body**. Paul, also referencing Genesis 2.21-24, says in Ephesians 5.30-32, "For we are members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones. For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother, and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh. But I speak concerning **Christ** and the **church**." Here Paul is stating that 'Jesus' whole body' = 'Jesus (the Bridegroom)' + 'the multitudes of people (the bride)', making it quite clear that 'Jesus' body' is being

used symbolically and figuratively, <u>not</u> literally as Catholicism insists upon asserting. Therefore, after knowing and understanding the symbolic language of Christ in Matthew 19.3-10, it becomes obvious that, while the Pharisees were questioning Jesus in terms of 'adultery between a man and woman', Jesus was replying to them (speaking <u>above</u> their level of understanding on a macro level) saying that 'The Pharisees and their forefathers were the ones who have committed adultery, having <u>separated</u> what God had joined into <u>one body</u>: 'Christ (the Bridegroom)' and 'the multitudes of people (the bride)'. And so again, Jesus had been using the symbolic language of 'His body' the entire time He taught. Hence it was nothing new for Jesus to <u>symbolize</u> 'His whole body of believers' with 'a whole loaf of bread' at the Last Supper.

To <u>further prove</u> that Jesus was speaking <u>symbolically</u> at the Last Supper - referring to 'the whole loaf of bread' as 'Himself + the multitudes of people' - we must look at what Jesus says immediately after 'He breaks the whole loaf into pieces'. In Matthew 26.31 and Mark 14.27, just 5 verses after 'breaking the loaf of bread in pieces' and then saying 'This is My body', Jesus says to His disciples "All of you will be made to stumble, for it is written (in Zechariah 13.7): 'I will strike the **Shepherd**, and the sheep of the flock will be scattered". If the parallel is made (Shepherd + flock) = (Bridegroom + bride), then, noting that (Bridegroom + bride) = (Jesus' whole body), we can now also say that (Shepherd + flock) = (Jesus' whole body). Therefore, if we rewrite Matthew 26.31 and Mark 14.27 with this understanding, it becomes obvious that these verses actually encompass both symbolic meanings of 'Jesus breaking a loaf of bread that He refers to as His body'. Matthew 26.31 and Mark 14.27 rewritten would say, 'All of you will be made to stumble, for it is written: 'My physical body will be broken, therefore My body of believers will also be broken'.' Here you can clearly see that A) "I will strike the Shepherd" = 'My physical body will be broken'; which represents the first symbolic meaning of 'Jesus breaking a loaf of bread that He refers to as His body'. And $\underline{\mathbf{B}}$ "the sheep of the flock will be scattered" = 'My body of believers will also be broken'; which represents the **second** symbolic meaning of 'Jesus breaking a loaf of bread that He refers to as His body'. In other words:

A) the **first** symbolic meaning: broken loaf of bread = broken Shepherd = broken physical body of Jesus

B) the second symbolic meaning: broken loaf of bread = broken flock = broken body of believers

Think about it. From the end of chapter 10 in 1 Corinthians, to the end of chapter 12, Paul is <u>symbolically</u> referring to 'the body of Christ' as 'a body of people'. 1 Corinthians 10.17 says that 'one loaf of bread = one body of people'. As Paul instructs on the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians 11.17-34, he says 'I do not praise you, for when you come together for the Lord's Supper there are <u>divisions</u> among you' (verses 17-18). So Paul is saying that 'the idea of the Lord's Supper is to be <u>one body of people'</u>, yet the people were <u>dividing</u> among themselves, thereby <u>defeating the purpose</u> of coming together as <u>one body</u>; which reinforces the reality that, as much as they tried to be 'one body of people', it was <u>impossible</u>, as <u>Jesus had not yet</u> returned to make the body whole again (see the following paragraph). Paul continues in verse 29 saying, 'Those who come to the Lord's Supper to get <u>drunk</u> or <u>cause division</u> are not eating and drinking in a manner that is fitting for <u>members</u> of the body of believers in Christ'. Then, in 1 Corinthians 12.12-31 (<u>immediately after</u> speaking about the Last Supper), Paul speaks <u>in depth</u> on how 'Christ's

body of believers is made up of many different people or members'; which he also likens to actual body parts of a human body to symbolize how, just as eyes, ears, and hands are all necessary to form a human body, we (members) are all necessary to form 'a whole body of people'. Note that 'members' here has double meaning; 'a part of the human body' or 'a person belonging to a group'. Paul even says in verse 13 'We all drink into one Spirit', from which we can draw the parallel that 'by eating from one loaf of bread, we all eat into one body of Christ's people'; not 'we all eat Christ's actual body', as Catholicism asserts. This is also echoed in 1 Corinthians 10.16-17: 'The one bread which we break and eat is the coming together (or communion) of the members of the one body of Christ'. I.e., we 'eat into' one body of Christ; we don't eat the literal body of Christ. Now after identifying Paul's figurative language being used in this context, a major question arises. 'Why does Paul (i.e., 1 Corinthians chapter 12) immediately go into a long-winded discussion about 'the body of people' after just mentioning the Last Supper in chapter 11, and does **not** go into a long-winded discussion about 'the supposed actual <u>flesh</u> or body of Christ', if the <u>Eucharist</u> (the <u>supposed</u> centerpiece of Paul's <u>supposed</u> new religion) <u>actually existed</u>, and was an idea that Paul was in fact <u>trying</u> to convey?' That is, <u>if</u> the Last Supper actually involved the **transubstantiation** of 'bread into the actual flesh or body of Christ', then it **does** not make any sense at all (if you believe Catholic doctrine) that Paul, after talking about the Last **Supper** in 1 Corinthians Chapter **11**, would immediately go into almost a whole chapter's worth (i.e., 1 Corinthians chapter 12) of dissertation about 'the body of people', and not a whole chapter's worth of dissertation about 'the actual flesh or body of Christ'. Think about it. If you were Paul, would this 'supposed miracle of transubstantiation' not be all you were talking about if it actually existed?... especially after just mentioning the Last Supper. Thus, with Paul speaking extensively in 1 Corinthians regarding 'Christ's whole **body** of believers being **Symbolized** with a **whole loaf of bread** and a **human** <u>body'</u> - **totally ignoring** that 'the loaf of bread' is <u>supposedly</u>, by Catholic <u>mis</u>interpretation, 'the actual flesh of Christ' - and coupling that with Jesus' own symbolic use of the word 'body' in places like Matthew 5.27-30, Matthew 6.22-23, Luke 11.33-36, and Matthew 19.3-10, it proves without question that 'the loaf of bread at the Last Supper' was purely Symbolic of Jesus' body (both 'His actual living, breathing body' and 'His body of believers'). In addition, this also proves that any and all literal interpretations of 'eating the actual body of Christ' have been fabricated by Catholicism for 'the *sole purpose* of *justifying* their unique ability to perform the act of transubstantiation'; which of course grants them 'the unrighteous control over Jesus', and consequently 'the unrighteous control over nations and multitudes of people'.

Finally, we must consider that, if 'Jesus' whole body of believers' was scattered or broken when He was crucified, at what point will it be whole again? When will the Bridegroom and the bride be again one flesh, or one body? The answer is quite simply 'at the time of Jesus 2nd coming'. If it takes 'a bridegroom and bride' to make one body, we (the bride) cannot be one whole body without the Bridegroom. This is articulated in the book of Zechariah. 13.7 says, concerning the crucifixion, "Strike the Shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered". Then 3 verses later in 14.1, 2, 3, 5, and 9 Zechariah says 'The day of the Lord is coming when the Lord will gather together and fight against all the nations (referring to the Battle of

Armageddon and **the 2nd coming of Jesus**). Thus the Lord my God will come, and all the saints with Him, and the Lord shall be **King** over all the earth. In that day it shall be that the Lord is **ONE** and <u>His name</u> one.' Therefore Zechariah, whom Jesus directly quoted on the night of the Last Supper, makes it clear that from the time when 'Jesus' body of believers is scattered and broken' to the time when 'Jesus' body of believers is unified back into one body' is the time span 'from Jesus' death until His return'. And so while 'one whole loaf of bread' is symbolic of 'unity' and 'one whole body of people', the body cannot be one whole (i.e., 'the Lord is one and His name one') until the return of Christ. I.e., the bride cannot be 'one body with the Bridegroom' until 'the Bridegroom returns to marry the bride'. At the End of the Age (also called 'the <u>consummation</u> of the world') - when Jesus returns to defeat the Catholic Beast and the false prophet (the Pope) - Jesus will be married to His people, and they together with Christ will be one flesh, or one body. This marriage is foretold in Revelation 19.7-9: "For the marriage of the Lamb has come, and <u>His wife</u> has made herself ready. Blessed are those who are called to <u>the</u> marriage supper of the Lamb!" Therefore we should not be confused when the Catholic hierarchy holds up their false Jesus (the Eucharist) in Mass saying, 'Behold, this is the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. Happy are those who are called to His supper.' The institution of Catholicism does not hold 'the marriage supper of the Lamb' every week in Mass, and is **not**, as they assert, the bride of Christ; they are rather the unknowing Beast. The Catholic Church has claimed for 2000 years that they are already married to Christ as His wife or bride, but no one is married to Christ yet, and the true 'marriage supper of the Lamb' is yet to occur. The true marriage supper will occur once the two beasts (the Catholic Church and the Pope) are defeated at the time of the 2nd coming of Christ. And so *the* Catholic Church (i.e., the Beast disquised as the bride) is a false bride, and they defile the true meaning of 'the marriage supper of the Lamb' by holding a false marriage supper every week in the presence of their 'false lamb'; the Eucharist.

There are a few other points concerning Catholicism's **literal** interpretations of 'the **figurative** language surrounding the Last Supper'. First, if Jesus was speaking literally during the Last Supper (which He was not), why does He immediately return to figurative language after breaking bread? In Matthew 26.31 and Mark 14.27 - which is immediately after supper - Jesus figuratively refers to His Apostles as "sheep". And so if we were to use the same deductive reasoning and literal interpretation methods that the Catholic Church uses, we must assume that Jesus' Apostles were physically changed from 'men into sheep'. I.e., the Catholic Church has taken it upon themselves to assert that 'Jesus had begun speaking plainly or literally (as in John 16.25) at the Last Supper', therefore we must assume that 'the Apostles literally became sheep'. Obviously this line of reasoning is a joke, making the doctrine of Catholicism a joke as well; unfortunately their doctrine is a 'sick joke'. Second, consider that, since Jesus obviously had the power to 'transform bread into flesh' if He wanted to, then the Apostles actually consumed raw flesh at the Last Supper; at least according to 'Catholic <u>literal</u> interpretation'. Sounds 'kind of strange' and 'pagan-like' when it's put like that, doesn't it? The fact is that the Catholic Church has isolated <u>fragments</u> of Scripture and given them <u>literal meaning</u> for the sole purpose of assuming authority over God's (figurative) vineyard. The fact is that their literal interpretations turn Jesus' figurative language into complete nonsense. When Jesus returns is 'when' He will speak to us 'plainly and literally'. And

when Jesus returns, He will prove all of the <u>Catholic literal interpretations</u> to be 'complete and utter nonsense' that serve only the purpose of glorifying 'man and Satan', not God.

Thus, by Catholicism's literal interpretations they have managed to totally fabricate a false idol that never actually existed. So, we recognize that one the most convincing aspects concerning this 'total fabrication of the Eucharist', is that the Eucharist is never mentioned in the Bible. We must recognize that 'what is not said' in the Bible, may be speaking louder than 'what is said'. In fact, when you read the Bible, you will see that much of the Catholic doctrine handed down as sacred tradition has no biblical basis whatsoever. Over and over again, Catholicism - under the disquise of being led by the Holy Spirit - has simply 'taken God's and Jesus' name in vain' and then 'said that God or Jesus said' (Jeremiah 23.31). But if Jesus truly 'said' and intended for us to 'eat and worship His actual body in the form of the Eucharist', would it not be plastered all over the New Testament? If Jesus truly intended for the Eucharist to be the cornerstone of His supposedly newfound religion, would it not be all that Paul, John, Peter, and the rest of the Apostles were talking about after Jesus' resurrection? But it wasn't all that they were talking about. And in fact, they did not talk about it at all, simply because Catholicism fabricated the Eucharist after the Apostles were dead and gone in order to gain the authority that is perceived by being associated with Christ. And so the following is a list of places and occurrences where the Eucharist should have been mentioned in the New Testament, but was not.

- 1. Jesus ate with His Apostles on a number of occasions <u>after</u> His resurrection, and <u>not once</u> did He remind them about the Eucharist; the <u>supposed</u> <u>cornerstone</u> teaching of His church.
- 2. In Revelation Jesus **critiques** seven different churches. The churches of Pergamos and Thyatira were **eating** food sacrificed to false idols. If Jesus was correcting these churches, why would He **not** tell them to 'eat the Eucharist' or 'eat His body' **instead of** 'eating food sacrificed to false idols'? Did Jesus' own (supposed) **cornerstone** teaching slip His mind, or did it simply **never exist**?
- 3. In 2 Peter 1.15, Peter says "I will be careful to ensure that you always have <u>a reminder</u> of (the true teachings of Christ) after my death". If the Eucharist was actually 'the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Christ', then would the Eucharist not be the <u>supreme reminder</u> of Christ and His teachings. Therefore, you would think that Peter would go on to tell us that he wants us to <u>remember</u> above all things the <u>Eucharist</u>; the supposed <u>cornerstone</u> of their new religion. But he did no such thing, and once again there is <u>no mention</u> of the Eucharist. And ironically, Peter says in verse 16 the very <u>next verse</u> "For we did not follow <u>cunningly devised fables</u> when we told you about the power of Christ". Be assured that 'the transubstantiation of the Eucharist' is the <u>most</u> cunningly devised fable of all time. Additionally, at the beginning of chapter 2, Peter warns us of bold and arrogant "false prophets and teachers who will <u>secretly bring in destructive and untrue doctrines</u>"; such as the transubstantiation of the Eucharist. Peter even speaks about 'corruptible <u>false idols</u> of silver and gold that are <u>blindly passed down as a tradition of their forefathers</u>" (1 Peter 1.18), but still no mention of the Eucharist; which is of course 'a <u>false idol</u> blindly passed down as a <u>sacred tradition</u> of the Catholic Forefathers'.

- 4. In Acts 9.40, we see that <u>Peter could raise people from the **dead**</u>, but there is <u>still no mention</u> of Peter actually 'transforming bread into flesh'. Why? Miracles were clearly taking place through Peter by God, so <u>why would God not send a Eucharistic Miracle to be performed by Peter</u>? He is supposedly 'the rock' on which the Catholic Church is built, right? The fact is that 'Peter's supposed keys of authority' and 'the Eucharistic Miracles' are mere fabrications of the Catholic Church to secure control over the minds and consciences of the multitudes; and this becomes apparent when you consider that <u>not one Eucharistic Miracle is documented in the New Testament</u> out of <u>all</u> the miracles that were performed by the Apostles.
- mention of the entire 'This is My body' exchange in his gospel. And, strangely enough, during the Last Supper, Jesus does clarify His 'new Commandment' to "Love one another" (John 13.34), yet neglects to clarify any addendums to the 1st Commandment pertaining to the creation of idols or images. Additionally, in John's 3 epistles he continually stresses the need to be 'on guard' against false teachers; such as the Catholic Forefathers. John coined the term 'antichrist' as someone who was 'from the Apostles' but not 'of the Apostles'; someone who spoke the same words as Christ and His Apostles, yet changed the intention those words for their own glory and the glory of the Antichrist (i.e., Satan). John's 'number one message' was to be on guard against evil deceivers: people who 'Boldly assert that they are in the light, yet hate others, and thus are in darkness to this very hour' (1 John 2.9). And instead of John reminding us about the Eucharist in his first epistle, the very last line ironically reads "Little children, keep yourselves from idols".
- 6. After the gospels, practically <u>every</u> writer in the New Testament warns us about 'false teachers, false apostles, false prophets, and false idols'. Yet there is still no mention of the <u>Eucharist</u>; noting that, if the Eucharist was real, the writers would surely mention it so that we did not mistake it as one of the false idols that they were talking about. And so the reality is that the writers of the New Testament were trying to warn us about the false apostles of the Catholic Church and their false idol, the Eucharist; they were warning us about the very people who have blindly and unknowingly passed down the New Testament writings. In addition, you can probably read most any page in the Old Testament and they (the true Prophets) are speaking out against the multitude of false prophets and their false idols. Human nature man's lust for <u>supremacy</u> over his fellow man has not changed in the last 6000 years, and today we still have the same multitude of false prophets, clothed as 'sheep', and 'lusting after the supremacy of God'. And some of the most believable ones belong to the Catholic Church.
- 7. Paul's writing 'takes up' about <u>half</u> of the New Testament. <u>In all that writing he does not even mention the Eucharist one time</u>. The only mention of the Last Supper in 1 Corinthians gives a very different meaning of the Last Supper than what the Catholic Church has given us. Are we to believe that the <u>most prolific writer</u> of the New Testament, a well-educated Pharisee who spoke a few languages and covered a multitude of topics, <u>could not give complete and decisive</u> <u>instruction on the proper consecration and meaning of the Eucharist</u>? The fact is, Paul did not

give complete and decisive instruction because there was nothing to instruct 'on or about'. Hence, the Eucharist was totally fabricated 'post-Paul'.

- 8. In Acts 20.7-12 Paul 'comes together with some disciples to <u>break bread</u>'. At the fellowship meal, Paul does <u>not</u> even mention the Eucharist at all? Why? The Eucharist is <u>supposed</u> to be 'the center point' of the fellowship meal and the <u>cornerstone</u> of Jesus' (supposed) newfound religion, is it not?
- 9. Why would the book of <u>Hebrews</u> (especially chapters 8-10) go <u>on and on</u> about a **New Covenant** that <u>eliminated</u> 'priests (i.e., false mediators), purification ceremonies, food and drink offerings, sacrifices, and various other rituals', then <u>not</u> mention one word about the <u>Eucharist</u> or <u>any other ritual</u> that the Catholic Church performs? Therefore it is **double minded** and nonsensical to think that the book of Hebrews supports Catholicism in any way. The truth is that 'the essence of the book of Hebrews is in <u>direct opposition to Catholicism</u> and all of its <u>necessary</u> rituals and faux sacrifices'.

Many people will say 'If the Eucharist is a false idol, then how is it possible that it, and of course Catholicism, have <u>survived</u> for <u>nearly</u> **2000** <u>years</u>? How is it possible that God would allow (or 'look away from', not 'approve of') such blatant idolatry to continue for so long?' While God's timeline may be beyond our comprehension, there are many examples throughout history of idolatry and evil that has been allowed to continue, seemingly unchecked. Additionally, prosperity would many times be accompanied by the idolatry, thereby justifying, and consequently perpetuating the idolatry for Many generations and hundreds of years. It must be recognized that one of the main contributing factors of Catholicism's longevity - and consequently the Eucharist's longevity - is the lack of biblical knowledge among the multitudes of people up until the end of the Dark Ages. With the invention of the printing press in 1450 AD, the Bible soon became accessible to the masses. Therefore it is not coincidental that the Protestant Reformation (1517 AD) took place almost immediately following the invention of the printing press; which gave people access to Jesus' unfiltered words, in their own language for the first time. Consider the following as a means of grasping God's timeline and further understanding that 'man has been practicing idolatry since the beginning'; of course meaning that the idolatry of the Catholic Church, while the greatest the world has ever seen, is by no means a newfangled idea.

- 1. <u>Adam and Eve</u>, as well as <u>Noah</u>, practiced idolatry (i.e., 'wanted to be <u>supreme</u> like God') by ruling unjustly over their people, effectively creating 'a false god' or 'a set of false man-made beliefs' that the people should 'bow to' instead of the one true God.
- 2. <u>Jacob</u> (i.e., Israel) and his household <u>worshiped false gods</u> (with false idols) as noted in Genesis 35.2-4.
- 3. <u>The **Egyptians** prospered</u>, practiced **idolatry**, and enslaved 'God's chosen people', the Israelites, for +/- <u>400 years</u>.

- 4. After being given the 10 Commandments, the Israelites <u>almost immediately</u> started <u>practicing</u> <u>idolatry</u> by making and worshiping a <u>golden calf</u>; of course leading Moses to continually remind his people to 'not make and worship carved images or <u>any likeness</u> of anything that is in heaven or on earth'.
- 5. The <u>entire Old Testament text</u> which covers a time span of about <u>3500 years</u> is basically a recurring account of people who practiced <u>idolatry</u>.
- 6. In Ezekiel 4.4-6, God tells Ezekiel that he must <u>lay on his side for 430 days</u> to bear the iniquity of Israel and Judah; <u>one day for every year of their iniquity</u>. So this equates to <u>430 years</u> of iniquity; with their iniquity of course stemming from the worshipping of false gods.
- 7. Jeremiah after stating in chapter 11 how 'Israel and Judah have broken God's Covenant by going after and serving other gods' - asks God 'why He has allowed them to prosper, grow, and bear fruit' (Jeremiah 12.1-2). Therefore, this should remind us that, just because the Catholic Church may appear to be 'prospering, growing, and bearing fruit', it does not mean that they have upheld God's Commandments and the New Covenant. Also remember that the pagan Egyptians prospered while the Israelites, God's people, were enslaved; much like Catholicism has prospered over the last 1700 years while Jesus' true believers have been enslaved. Do not be fooled by prosperity. Just because a nation, kingdom, or institution has prospered, it does not mean that they follow God's laws (remember that Satan tempted Jesus with the control of nations). Prosperity leads people to **believe** that 'their wrong actions are actually right'. This leads to pride, and 'pride is what precedes destruction' (Proverbs 16.18). The Egyptians were allowed to prosper and enslave the Israelites for +/- 400 years, but in the end, God cut the Egyptians down with plagues and death, and there was a mass exodus from bondage. Likewise, when Jesus returns, He will cut down all religions starting with Catholicism, and there will be a mass exodus from spiritual slavery far greater than the first exodus out of Egypt. So again, do not be fooled by Catholicism's prosperity; it has only perpetuated their idolatry.
- 8. As Jesus said 'the tares' will grow right alongside 'the wheat' (Matthew 13.30) Until 'the harvest' at the End of the Age; i.e., Jesus' 2nd coming. The problem for the Catholic hierarchy is that they think they are 'the wheat', but they are really 'the tares' because they are 'the cause of people sinning' (Matthew 18.7). Ask the Pharisees back in Jesus' day if they thought they were 'the wheat' or they were 'the tares'? Obviously just like the Catholic hierarchy they would confidently say 'We are the wheat'. Additionally, while it may appear as though God has allowed Catholicism's idolatry to continue unfettered as in 'the tares growing uncontrollably' consider the Protestant Reformation and the formation of the United States; both of which are in direct opposition to Catholicism's dictator-like regime.
- 9. As noted in the Revelation of Peter (79,31-81,3), "For a specified time <u>proportionate to their</u> <u>error</u>, (the false prophets of our religions, namely Catholicism) will rule over the little ones". The Catholic Church's error is <u>the greatest</u> the world has ever seen. If 'the length of time is

<u>proportionate</u> to their error', then <u>the length of time</u> that the Catholic hierarchy will be allowed to 'rule over and deceive the little ones' will be a **great** length of time, such as **2000 years**.

10. <u>Hinduism</u> has been around since roughly 3000 BC. Likewise, <u>Buddhism</u> started in 500 BC and <u>Judaism</u> in 2000 BC. God has clearly <u>allowed these religions to remain intact for much longer than Catholicism/Christianity</u> has even been in existence. And since <u>each and every religion</u> = <u>a</u> <u>false god</u>, God has allowed - i.e., *'looked away from'*, <u>not</u> *'approved of'* - the worship of false gods in the form of organized religion for <u>at least **5000 years**</u>.

Look at the Old Testament and how much <u>idolatry</u> went on for <u>thousands of years</u>; right inside God's (supposed) temple by <u>His own people</u>. We should not be so naïve as to think that human nature <u>changed 2000 years ago</u> and idolatry <u>ceased to exist</u>; it just 'got a lot harder to spot' 2000 years ago. Instead of using 'a golden calf' to represent God, vain Catholic Forefathers seeking more power, simply made 'a false Jesus' (the Eucharist) to represent God in order to institute man-made laws that were <u>disquised as</u> God's laws. And so the idolatry in the Catholic Church is <u>nothing new</u> in terms of the history written in the Old Testament; although <u>by naming their false idol 'Jesus'</u>, the Catholic Church has <u>managed to keep their idolatry hidden</u> and <u>well disquised</u> for an extended period of time.

When considering why God has allowed (i.e., 'looked away from', not 'approved of') idolatry to continue for so long, we must understand and remember that God gave us freewill to fall into error and corruption; remembering that God's laws of truth are written on our hearts, and we only fall into error when our hearts become hardened by man-made teachings. It is interesting to note that the Catholic hierarchy - the ones guilty of the greatest error and corruption in history - is quick to stand by two totally **opposing** viewpoints in terms of **freewill**. 'Catholicism's theory of an incorruptible church' says 'God would not allow us (as a whole) to fall into error (No), yet God has given us (individually) total freewill (Yes)'. To say this is to speak with a double tongue; either you are free to fall into error (whether it is **1 person** or **1 million people**), or you are **not** free to fall into error. To say that 'God will stop you from falling into error' is to say that 'you do not have freewill'. Additionally, you can't say 'We want freewill, but we don't want that much freewill that we would fall into error'. This is in effect saying that you want <u>limited freewill</u>. You want <u>freedom with restrictions</u>; that 'type of freedom' is <u>not</u> freedom at all. That 'type of freedom' is the false freedom that the Catholic hierarchy peddles as true freedom. God gives true freedom, not 'freedom with restrictions'. Besides, anytime God sent a Prophet to correct error and corruption - as He has no doubt done over the last 2000 years - the people would either beat or kill the Prophet, basically telling God 'Don't meddle with our freewill'. Therefore God, who grants true freedom and true freewill, has allowed the Catholic Church to freely fall into error and corruption for nearly 2000 years; regardless if Catholicism insists that 'they are incapable of falling into error'.

Thus the Eucharist is the false idol by which Catholicism has <u>freely fallen</u> deep into *error* and *corruption*. By creating a false idol, and insisting that 'all who do not worship their false idol will be <u>CONDEMNED</u> to <u>eternal damnation</u>', Catholicism has triggered a <u>chain reaction</u> of <u>supremacy</u> and <u>exclusion</u>; which of course <u>breeds</u> 'division, war, and hate'. Saying 'salvation only comes to those who belong to a certain group' makes people who do not feel a part of that certain group 'divide off and form their own

group'. Once this new group starts to believe that 'there is no salvation outside their new group', then dissent and hate leads to war between the two groups. Is this not what happened with Islam and the Protestant religions who 'split from' or 'would not concede to' Catholicism's false idol, the Eucharist? We must remember that Jesus, knowing that 'the Jews believed everyone outside their group would not receive salvation', spoke against the Jewish inherited mindset of supremacy and exclusion saying, 'Those who think they are first will be last' (Matthew 20.16). And so the Eucharist, being 'the source of worldwide exclusion and supremacy', is a false idol that actually represents the opposite of the very essence of Christ and His teachings; which consequently makes the Eucharist 'our hidden source of worldwide division, war, and hate'. The Catholic hierarchy will say 'All we want is peace and unity'. But, since they are blind puppets and slaves of Satan who are controlled by the false idol that they have used to control others with, they can't 'see' that they are actually harboring 'the very source of worldwide division, war, and hate'. And, if we are all truly of one body, and they are slaves to Satan and his false idol, then unfortunately the whole world is also enslaved to Satan and the Eucharist through 'the division, war, and hate' that it causes.

Therefore, since humanity is **one body** (although currently 'a broken body'), we must recognize that the Eucharist, as the source of our division, affects not just Catholics, but every person on this earth. It affects people who don't even realize 'it affects them'. It affects people who say 'I don't care about religion or the Eucharist', as they don't realize the hidden effects it has on their life. But they would care if they realized the magnitude of Catholicism's idolatry. The lies spoken by the Catholic hierarchy from behind the Eucharist are responsible for every religion's false perception of 'Who Jesus really is'. These lies portray Jesus as 'Someone who created the supremacy and exclusion of Catholicism', thereby ultimately portraying Jesus as 'Someone who created our present state of division, war, and hate'. And so the entire world has received a false idea of 'Who Jesus is' and 'What He stood for' from Catholicism. Because of this false persona of Jesus spoken from behind the Eucharist, humanity has literally, for nearly 2000 years, killed itself for no reason at all; truly making the Eucharist the hidden Abomination of Desolation. Thus, as one body of people, we all unknowingly bear the consequences of Catholicism's hidden idolatry. We all, as one body, bear the mental, physical, and spiritual slavery that are the consequences of speaking lies in God's name from behind a false idol. We all, as one body, bear the responsibility of the actions of the Catholic Forefathers. And so the future of our peace rests upon recognizing and destroying the lies that were created by the Catholic Forefathers and then propagated by the Catholic hierarchy. I.e., the future of our peace rests upon destroying the Catholic Church's wall of lies; which is of course built upon their cornerstone, the Eucharist. Therefore, we will not have true world peace until 'the cornerstone of the Catholic Church's wall of lies' is removed and **destroyed**.

9. Blind Hypocrisy caused by the Sacrament of Confession

'The Parable of the <u>Unforgiving Servant</u>' from Matthew 18.23-35 is summarized as follows.

There was a King who wanted to settle accounts with his servants. A servant was brought in who owed millions of dollars. The King was going to have him sold as a slave, so the servant fell on his knees and begged for the King's mercy. The King was moved to compassion because of the servant's <u>sincerity</u>, and so the King <u>forgave</u> all of the servant's debt. Immediately, the forgiven servant went and found a fellow servant who owed him a few dollars. He began to choke him and demanded the money that he owed. The fellow servant fell down on his knees and begged for mercy, just as the forgiven servant did to the King. But, the forgiven servant refused to forgive his fellow servant, even knowing that the King had just canceled all of his debt; knowing he was **just like** the fellow servant. So the 'forgiven servant' was now an 'unforgiving servant' toward others (i.e., a blind hypocrite), and he proceeded to have his fellow servant thrown in prison until he could pay back the debt. When the King found out what happened, he said to the unforgiving servant "You should have had mercy on your fellow servant just as I had mercy on you". The King then revoked his forgiveness and sent the unforgiving servant to prison where he was tortured until he paid back the entire amount he originally owed. Jesus then concluded, "This is how My Father in heaven will treat every one of you unless you forgive your brother from your heart" (Matthew 18.35).

If you are Catholic, then this parable should sound COntradictory to the mindset of 'asking forgiveness in the Sacrament of Confession and being absolved of your sins'. The entire **premise** of this parable is stating that 'those who are forgiven without forgiving others will develop a hypocritical mindset and consequently a sense of <u>supremacy</u> toward others, leading them to <u>judge</u> others for lesser sins than what they are blindly quilty of. And so Jesus' basic message was that 'true forgiveness comes from forgiving others, not by giving lip service to the King (i.e. God)'; as is done in the Sacrament of Confession. This basic teaching is echoed in Matthew 6.14-15. Jesus says "If you forgive others the wrongs they have done to you, your Father in heaven will <u>also forgive you</u>. But if you do not forgive others, then your Father will **not** forgive the wrongs you have done". In other words Jesus is saying 'If you do not forgive others, God will measure back to you the same measure you use for others' (Matthew 6.15 and 7.2); i.e., the unforgiving servant was thrown in prison for throwing his fellow servant in prison. So as you can see, there is a **big difference** between 'the false forgiveness of being forgiven in the Sacrament of Confession' and 'the true forgiveness of simply forgiving others'. In the Sacrament of Confession, Catholics are merely taught 'the art of forgiving yourself without forgiving others'. 'Confessing your sins to a priest' - as he has no knowledge of whether or not you have forgiven others - is merely forgiving yourself; i.e., it does not imply that you have forgiven others, thus receiving true forgiveness. Therefore Catholics, by actually participating in the Sacrament of Confession for many years, are in fact slowly and methodically trained to be more like the hypocritical unforgiving servant who was <u>absolved</u> of his debt (or 'forgiven <u>without forgiving others'</u>), and consequently developed a mindset of supremacy and judgment toward his fellow servant, instead of equality and empathy.

Catholics - by having their 'sense of true good and evil' warped by the Catholic hierarchy - are slowly and methodically trained to be more like the unforgiving servant who also obviously did not understand the magnitude of his sins, and had lost his 'sense of true good and evil', condemning someone for something so **trivial** when his sin was so **great**. The unforgiving servant should have had an easier time recognizing that he was 'the same man as his fellow servant' - in fact, even worse, because he owed millions compared to a few dollars - but he could not, thereby making him a **blind hypocrite**: 'someone who redefines and justifies his own debt (i.e., sin), while not showing any willingness to justify another person's debt'. Examples of this include: A) 'condemning someone who stole a loaf of bread (a small amount of money), while you redefine and justify theft by overbilling a client (a large amount of money)', **B)** 'condemning a drunk driver for accidentally killing someone (one person), while you redefine and justify murder which is caused by speaking slanderous lies that lead to hate, and consequently hundreds or thousands of deaths (many people)', and C) pertaining mainly to our religious leaders, 'condemning individuals for the micro level sin of adultery between a man and woman, while they redefine and justify their macro level sin of adultery with Satan, which causes the desolation of humanity'. All of these examples show how we can become a blind hypocrite just like the unforgiving servant, condemning others for far less than what we are blindly responsible for. And all of these examples show Satan's cunning ability to redefine sin (i.e., right and wrong) so that we become totally blind, thereby 'pointing our finger at those who are less quilty than us, while thinking that we are innocent'; remembering of course that 'a spiritually blind Saul', thinking he was innocent because he abided by Judaism's rituals and ceremonies (which would be comparable to the Sacrament of Confession), went out and 'beat and killed' those who he thought were guilty. Thus 'The Parable of the Unforgiving Servant' is proof from Jesus that being 'forgiven without forgiving others', or 'absolved in the Sacrament of Confession', is not the way true forgiveness works, and actually contributes to total spiritual blindness through the development of a supreme, judgmental, and hypocritical mindset; hence making the Sacrament of Confession totally **contradictory** to the teaching of Jesus. And so 'forgiveness granted in the Sacrament of Confession' is false forgiveness that is man's law created by Catholicism in the Dark Ages to ensure their own supremacy, power, and authority. I.e., 'forgiveness granted in the Sacrament of Confession' it is not 'God's or Jesus' Law', but rather Satan's law that he has placed right next to God's Law, with the intention of causing 'division, war, and hate'.

In a broad sense, 'The Parable of the Unforgiving Servant' applies to Catholicism as a whole. By believing that true forgiveness (which implies true salvation) comes only through the Catholic religion and the Sacrament of Confession, the voice of Catholicism as a whole projects a certain supremacy and judgment towards all who do not belong to Catholicism. In other words, Catholicism says 'We are forgiven by God and receive salvation, while we condemn all of our fellow servants (i.e. religions) to eternal prison'. And so it is this supremacy and judgment toward others that has been 'the breeding ground of division, war, and hate for 2000 years'. We must remember in this parable that Jesus was speaking to the Jews who had similar 'purification rituals' and 'priests who would offer sacrifices for sin' (i.e., 'works of the Jewish law'). Through their rituals, the Jews - just as the Catholics still do - believed that they and they alone were forgiven by God, and thus they alone would receive salvation; leading

of course to a supreme, judgmental mindset over the **Gentiles**. Note that this also implies that the Jews compared to 'their fellow servant Gentiles' - had sinned greatly against God and had become blind to their debt through their many rituals and sacrifices for sin. This is why Hebrews 9.9-10 says 'Offering aifts, making sacrifices, and performing various washings and fleshy ordinances Cannot make him who performed these things perfect in conscience'; with Hebrews 9.14 going on to say that 'These rituals - just as all of Catholicism's Sacraments - are all dead works'. And so 'The Parable of the Unforgiving Servant' has the same underlying theme that Jesus and the Prophets were continually conveying: 'God wants kindness, justice, and mercy, not sacrifices and rituals'. Sacrifices and rituals such as going to Confession and Mass - only 'honor God with our words, not with our hearts' (Matthew 15.8); which is exactly what the unforgiving servant did. Thus, Jesus ultimately conveys in this parable that, although the Jews believed with the Old Covenant that 'God forgave sins based on sacrifices and rituals', He was no longer going to allow that mindset with the sealing of the New Covenant, as the Jews (just as Catholics today) had developed a supreme, exclusive, and judgmental mindset because of their sacrifices and rituals; of course thinking that forgiveness and salvation was for them alone, not the Gentiles. This supreme, exclusive, and judgmental mindset associated with performing sacrifices and rituals is described in Isaiah 65.3-5. "You who sacrifice in gardens, burn incense on altars, and sit among the graves, say, 'Keep to yourself, do not come near me, for I am holier than you!'" Therefore Jesus concludes 'The Parable of the Unforgiving Servant' by essentially saying 'True forgiveness and true <u>salvation</u> only comes through **forgiving others**, and <u>not</u> by performing any type of **sacrifice** or **ritual** that begs forgiveness with meaningless words'; as the unforgiving servant obviously begged forgiveness with meaningless, although **seemingly** sincere, words.

One of the main reasons Catholicism cannot fathom that they are doing anything wrong in the Sacrament of Confession (or in any of their other idolatrous Sacraments) is that 'they are blind to Satan's cunning ability to redefine good and evil'; i.e., to redefine our sins. Just as Satan 'redefined good and evil to Adam and Eve in order to make them blindly sin' (see Section 1), Satan has done the same to Catholic leaders, and consequently their followers. Consider this: if people enter the confessional and 'confess non-sins' while blindly 'omitting real sins', then they will in fact have a wrong thought pattern reinforced, eventually leading them to 'judge people who are innocent as being guilty' (just as Jesus was judged as being guilty), and 'judge themselves and like-minded others as being innocent'. I.e., being commended and applauded when you have actually done something wrong, distorts your sense of what is truly right and wrong. Or, 'a wrong thought pattern is reinforced' and you blindly condemn those who have trivial sins, while not realizing the magnitude of your own 'real sins'. Think of 'a spiritually blind <u>Saul</u>' who was commended and applauded by his elders for 'defending the Jewish faith'; which was erroneously thought to be the same as 'defending God'. Saul obviously did not realize the magnitude of his own 'real sins' because the Jewish hierarchy (just as the Catholic hierarchy still does) had Warped his 'sense of true right and wrong', making him think that his 'real sins' were in fact 'non-sins'. So by 'redefining good and evil', Satan is able to induce total spiritual blindness, thereby creating a multitude of blind hypocrites (like Saul) who sin greatly, while condemning those who sin minimally. Ask yourself, 'When Jesus returns to oppose Catholicism, just as He opposed Judaism 2000

years ago, how many blind hypocrites like Saul will there be, **thinking** they are **defending** Jesus and God, while actually **opposing** Jesus and God?'

Here is one of the most basic examples that is at the core of Catholicism's supreme, exclusive, and judgmental doctrine that leads to the same blind hypocritical mindset as Saul. A man confesses to a priest that 'he missed Mass on Sunday'. While Catholicism classifies this as a mortal (real) sin, it is actually a non-sin; remembering that Jesus Himself did not keep the Sabbath (John 9.16, and see Section 14). If the man is trained to believe that 'by missing Mass he will go to hell', he will finally - out of unrighteous fear and guilt projected by the Catholic hierarchy - reside himself to go to Mass every Sunday. And of course once he has done this for a number of years, he starts to look at 'others (both Catholic and non-Catholic) who **do not** attend Mass' as 'people who are **going to hell** because they oppose the will of God' (which is actually the will of Satan). Therefore the Catholic hierarchy has slowly and methodically programmed this man - based on performing the rituals of Confession and Mass - to blindly think that 'he is first and others are last' in terms of salvation. You may think 'What difference does one person make?' Well consider what happens when say 1.2 billion people as a whole majority body start thinking that they are supreme to others simply because they perform a ritual every week; supremacy and judgment of others will no doubt lead to 'division, war, and hate'. Noting that this supremacy is hard to identify because it is an 'unspoken supremacy'; meaning 'no one really talks about it', it's just 'known' internally within Catholicism (or many other religions such as Islam) that 'salvation is exclusive to them and them alone'. So by the Catholic hierarchy themselves believing their <u>real sin</u> - stealing the names of Jesus and God, and speaking lies in Their names - is a **non-sin** (when it is really 'the greatest sin there is'), they have easily convinced the Catholic multitudes to 'bow down to and serve their false idol (the Eucharist) and false god (Catholicism) every week in Mass', making the multitudes also believe that 'their real sins (i.e., the many forms of unspoken supremacy that leads to division, war, and hate) are non-sins'. The Catholic hierarchy, by speaking lies in the names of Jesus and God, has redefined right and wrong, making it 'right to practice idolatry', and 'wrong not to practice idolatry'; which has only been compounded by the practice of 'confessing not practicing idolatry as a <u>sin</u>'. By this redefining of sin, the Catholic hierarchy has <u>warped</u> the minds of the multitudes, <u>causing</u> them to 'blindly sin' and 'blindly judge other non-sinners as sinners'; of course causing an unrighteous hypocritical mindset of supremacy and judgment. As Jesus says in Matthew 18.7, 'Woe to those who are the cause of sinning!' Thus the supremacy, judgment, and consequential hypocrisy taught by the Catholic hierarchy, then reinforced by the Sacrament of Confession - i.e., their systematic redefining of sins that leads to 'the confessing of non-sins' and 'the omission of real sins' - is the cause of blind Catholics, under the righteous disguise of 'evangelization and spreading the Good News', going out and blindly 'choking and imprisoning' their fellow servants. And it is this 'blind condemning of the innocent by the guilty' that is ultimately the <u>cause</u> of 'division, war, and hate'.

If you <u>do not</u> think that the Sacrament of Confession produces <u>unspoken</u> supremacy, judgment, and hypocrisy, then consider the phrase <u>'Perfect state of grace'</u>. 'Perfect state of grace' is a phrase used by the Catholic Church, and given to a penitent who has just confessed their sins to a priest. <u>If the penitent is in a 'Perfect state of grace'</u>, he will be more likely to <u>'look down on'</u> and judge others <u>as if he is in a superior position in terms of salvation</u>. The penitent slowly, yet surely, begins to believe <u>'I am first and</u>

they are last because I have abided by Catholicism's redefined version of good and evil'; which of course is not God's version of good and evil. But you must remember that Jesus, addressing the Jews who had an <u>exclusive</u> and <u>supreme</u> mindset by erroneously believing that 'salvation was theirs alone because they knew true right from wrong', said "Those who are last will be first, and those who are first will be last" (Matthew 20.16). The fact is, since Satan is a master at redefining sin and deceiving with names, a penitent - just as the Jews of Jesus' day - is blind and really doesn't even know what is 'true right and true wrong'. This allows Satan to masterfully rename his prison as a 'Perfect state of grace' so that Catholic slaves *never want to leave* their 'Perfect state of defilement'. I.e., by redefining right and wrong, Satan is able to also rename 'a state of being defiled by Satan's lies' as 'a state of true righteousness', deceptively making Catholics want to actually remain in 'a state of defilement', thinking it is 'a state of righteousness'. And Satan convinces members of the Catholic Church to push their 'state of spiritual defilement' on others as 'a state of spiritual grace'. That's why this mindset of spiritual supremacy - which is actually 'a state of blind, unknowing spiritual defilement' - left unchecked for century upon century, has no doubt fueled Satan's main objective; division that causes war and hate by spiritually blind people who are guilty (wrong) while thinking that they are actually innocent (right). Remember 'the quilty who thought they were innocent and righteous' were the ones who shouted 'crucify Him' to 'a Man who was innocent and thought to be guilty'. Satan is truly a master at redefining right and wrong, as he has been doing so from the beginning; feeding blind people 'poisonous fruit of redefined good and evil' in order to induce a false state of grace and righteousness. This 'state of having a warped sense of right and wrong' has no doubt been fueled and perpetuated by Catholicism's Sacrament of Confession, which 'forgives quilty people who then turn right around and condemn innocent people (or at least less quilty people than them)'. I.e., 'being forgiven without forgiving others' warps our sense of right and wrong, leading to a mindset of supremacy and judgment toward others. Note that, if this was <u>not true</u>, then Catholicism (namely the hierarchy) would not judge and condemn others - as if they are 'supreme like God' - to eternal damnation for not worshiping their false idol and bowing to their false god; which is ultimately them. I.e., 'there is no salvation without the Catholic hierarchy'. Thus, Jesus told 'The Parable of the Unforgiving Servant' as a teaching that illuminates the idea that 'being forgiven without forgiving others reinforces a wrong thought pattern as being right, thereby producing a mindset of supremacy, judgment, and hypocrisy that leads people to wrongly **believe** that they are in **a state of grace**'.

Protestants have a <u>similar</u> mindset to a 'Perfect state of grace' by erroneously thinking that they have been 'saved <u>apart from any good works</u> that they may do'. If this were true, then why do they bother doing any 'good works' at all? And so they are double minded, effectively saying 'You are saved <u>apart from</u> good words (yes), but you will <u>not</u> be saved <u>without</u> good works (no)'. This clearly proves that their reasoning is contradictory and from the mind of the Evil One. Additionally, we must ask the basic question, 'Why would Jesus bother telling us to 'love one another and show mercy', which <u>clearly involves good works</u>, if good works were not essential for salvation?' The problem for the Protestants is that they cannot recognize or interpret that Paul, when saying "Man is <u>not justified</u> by <u>works</u> of the (Jewish) <u>law</u>" (Galatians 2.16), meant that 'Man will not receive salvation based on whether or not he <u>performs sacrifices and rituals</u> (i.e., works) of the Jewish <u>law</u>, such as circumcision'; which by the way are <u>equivalent</u> to any of today's Christian Sacraments or ceremonies. I.e., 'good works' do <u>not</u> equal 'works

of the Jewish law'; they are totally different. Paul even goes on to say 'Those who think that they will be saved by performing rituals have actually fallen away from Christ' (Galatians 5.4). And so the Protestants have done just as Peter (2 Peter 3.15-16) has said, and misinterpreted Paul's writings, believing that 'if they perform the ritual or spiritual spell of repeating the words 'I believe in Jesus' 3 times - just like any other of the 'works of the law' - then they have summoned Jesus to be their personal Savior, aside from good works'. Thus the Protestants, just like the Catholics, believe the convoluted double thoughts of Satan, treating Jesus as if 'He is theirs and theirs alone (i.e., their personal Savior)', which eventually only produces exclusion, supremacy, and judgment; the breeding ground of 'division, war, and hate'. I.e., saying 'Jesus is my personal Savior' projects the exclusive, supreme mindset that 'I know God better than you, therefore I am better than you, and I will be saved while you are condemned'; which only produces dissension, hate, and fighting. Again, Jesus is our Savior because He came to 'remove the sin of idolatry from the world - remembering that idolatry = supremacy in order to bring about world peace'. In other words, Jesus came to abolish religion because they are all false gods that produce division and hinder peace. This is what it means to 'believe in Jesus'; not to just repeat the words 'I believe in Jesus', thereby merely honoring God with your words (Matthew 15.8). As 1 John 3.18 says, 'Do <u>not</u> love in <u>word</u> or in tongue, but in **deed** and in truth'. Words are meaningless to God, and so the only thing that does matter is the action (i.e., 'work' or 'deed') of 'loving others as yourself'. And if we 'love one another', then we already (either knowingly or unknowingly) love Jesus and know Jesus. In fact, Jesus even says in Matthew 25.31-46 that 'When He returns to judge the nations, those who have done good works (i.e., 'feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, etc.') were unknowingly doing good works towards Jesus Himself, and will therefore receive eternal life because <u>Of those good works</u>; with of course those who <u>did not</u> do good works, receiving everlasting punishment'. Hence the Protestant idea of 'salvation apart from works' - i.e., the idea that 'salvation is based on a perceived state of grace which is the result of merely saying 'I believe in Jesus" - is just one more deception from the twisted tongue of Satan that has produced a mindset of supremacy; which ultimately is 'the sin of idolatry that Jesus came to remove'.

So again, Satan is a master at 'redefining good and evil', making the guilty believe that they are innocent, the unrighteous believe that they are righteous, and the defiled believe that they are in a 'Perfect state of grace'. Satan of course accomplishes this by feeding spiritually blind people 'false knowledge of good and evil' or 'poisonous fruit' (see Section 1); remembering that spiritual blindness is produced by pride, vanity, and ultimately the envy of God's supremacy and authority. In particular Jesus focused on the Pharisees, Scribes, Chief Priests, and elders because they were the 'Blind leaders of the blind', causing their blind followers to 'do things they may otherwise not do'; such as 'convincing their blind followers to condemn an innocent Man as being guilty'. These leaders blindly thought that they were 'innocent, righteous, and full of grace' because Satan had 'redefined what was good and evil in their minds'. Satan accomplishes this by first 'stealing the name of God and His words' and then 'breathing false life into God's name and words with false interpretations'; which of course breathes false life into the persona of God, ultimately creating 'a false god' that goes by the name of 'God'. Then once Satan has redefined God's persona through false interpretations - which consequently redefines

good and evil - he is able to 'convince the guilty into blindly condemning the innocent', all while **thinking** they are 'innocent, righteous, and full of grace'.

One of the best examples of this from a biblical standpoint is Satan's ability to 'redefine Sexual right and wrong' so that 'the guilty blindly condemn the innocent'. As Satan does with many other misinterpretations, he literally interprets sexual language that is figurative (see Section 17) in order to demonize individual sexuality. The sexual language in the Bible was never meant to be interpreted on an individual, singular, micro level, but rather on a macro level pertaining to large groups of people. This macro level figurative sexual language (between God or Jesus 'the Bridegroom' and us 'the bride') had an ultimate message that was targeted at removing oppression and violence which stemmed from the idea that 'the leaders (being part of the **bride**) were acting as **harlots** by **fornicating** with Satan, thereby doing the will of their new husband (Satan), and thus eating his poisonous fruit of false supremacy'. I.e., the macro level figurative sexual language in the Bible was targeted at 'unjust rulers practicing supremacy, oppression, and violence', nOt 'individuals having sex'. So by Satan tricking us through the generations into 'literally interpreting figurative sexual language' - just as Satan tried to trick Jesus in the desert with literal interpretations of Psalm 91 - he has essentially redefined 'God's identity' and 'what is true good and evil', thereby taking our eye off the ball so that we A) blindly judge and condemn innocent individuals having sex outside of our man-made parameters of righteous sexuality, and B) blindly applaud and glorify guilty leaders who cause oppression and violence through supremacy and exclusion.

Thus, if Satan can turn 'evil into good' and 'good into evil' (Isaiah 5.20) - which thereby causes the guilty (who **think** they are innocent) to blindly condemn the <u>true</u> innocent - then he has achieved his goal of 'division, war, and hate' by making us blindly fight and kill each other for no reason at all. To do this, Satan must be a master at disguising his voice so that people actually believe that they are listening to the voice of God. Remember that Satan, by disguising his voice as God's voice, had a large majority of the Jewish religion believing that 'Jesus was actually sent by Satan'. Noting also that 'Satan disguised his voice as God's voice' to try and trick Jesus in the desert. Imagine 2000 years ago, coming face to face with Jesus. He starts telling you things that oppose your 2000-year-old Jewish religion; which by the way is equivalent to opposing the 2000-year-old Catholic religion in today's world. Satan, who has cleverly <u>disguised</u> his voice as God's voice, quickly tells your mind to <u>reject</u> this 'arrogant' Man as being from Satan. You, a blind follower of the blind Jewish teachers then agrees with Satan's voice because it corresponds with what they (the Jewish teachers) have taught you to think from the time of your childhood. And so even though 'the Light of the world is standing right in front of you' and is actually 'telling you what is true right', you can't believe Him or see Him because of the blindness and consequential darkness passed on to you from 'your teachers and the teachers before them'. I.e., you can't see that 'Jesus is the Light' because Satan's blind leaders have trained you to perceive 'Satan's darkness as light' and 'Jesus' light as darkness'; or 'evil is good' and 'good is evil'.

And so today, just as in Jesus' day, we do not know 'what is <u>true</u> good' and 'what is <u>true</u> evil' because Satan has '<u>redefined</u> good and evil', handed it to our ancestors, and then they handed it to us, thereby keeping us blind and in the darkness. As Jesus says in John 16.8-11, 'The world is <u>wrong</u> about <u>true</u>

righteousness, true sin, and true judgment'. Do not underestimate the deceptive powers

of Satan. Through redefining, Satan creates total spiritual blindness and darkness, thereby making the guilty believe that 'they are not doing anything wrong'. That is why it is so important to forgive others and **not** to ask false forgiveness from 'a 3rd party priest'; you may be 'omitting your real sin' because Satan has made you believe it is non-sin, and 'confessing a non-sin' that is not even a sin... all because you have no knowledge of 'what is true good' and 'what is true evil'. This 'lack of knowledge of true good and evil' is referred to in the Bible as 'nakedness'. If you are 'naked', you do not have 'the knowledge of true good and true evil', and so you of course walk around figuratively naked and unashamed (or proud of your ignorance) because you are spiritually blind; noting again that this metaphorical terminology originates from the story of Adam and Eve who 'blindly and nakedly' ate Satan's poisonous fruit of false knowledge (see Section 1). 'Metaphorical nakedness' implies a certain pride and arrogance in the man-made false knowledge of Satan. It is meant to convey the feeling of shame and embarrassment when - after receiving sight, or 'the true knowledge of good and evil' from Jesus, the Truth - you suddenly look down to see that you are naked in front of a crowd of clothed people. As Jesus says in Revelation 16.15, "Behold, I am coming like a thief. Blessed is he who watches, and keeps his garments (i.e., clothing), lest he walk naked and they see his shame". Additionally, this shame and embarrassment is conveyed Nahum 3.5, which is a prophecy against Nineveh for practicing idolatry that produced 'countless corpses'. The Lord says, "Behold, I am against you (Nineveh). I will lift your skirts over your face, I will show the nations your nakedness, and the kingdoms your shame." Therefore 'receiving spiritual sight' and 'realizing your metaphorical nakedness' is another way of saying that 'you have <u>suddenly realized</u> that you have been <u>wrong</u> (or ignorant), while you have insisted that you were right; which is usually followed by the placement of man-made lies or fig leaves over that nakedness. While if you 'have spiritual sight' and 'are truly metaphorically clothed', then God has given you 'the knowledge of true right and true wrong', and you have of course accepted (i.e., <u>conceded to</u> or believed in) His knowledge, <u>not</u> trying to 'cover over your nakedness with **fig leaves** of man-made wisdom'.

So we must recognize that, while many Christian/Catholics <u>claim</u> to have *spiritual sight*, and to be *spiritually clothed*, they are actually just like Adam and Eve, walking around *spiritually blind*, and consequently <u>unashamed</u> of their *nakedness* (i.e., lack of knowledge). To have 'true spiritual clothing' is to have the **knowledge** that, 'as <u>ONE spiritual body of people</u>, we all take <u>responsibility</u> for one another's sins'. I.e., if we are truly clothed, and therefore truly understand the concept of '<u>one body</u>' - remembering that 'one loaf of bread' and 'a physical body' were used in Section 8 to <u>symbolize</u> 'one body of people' - then we truly know that we Share in one another's sins because, as Paul says in Ephesians 4.25, "<u>We are members of one another</u>". Think about it. If your hand hit your foot with a hammer, would you (i.e., your <u>whole</u> human body) not feel the pain? So as your hand and your foot both share in the pain, both you and other people share in the pain of sin as one whole body of people. I.e., just as a hand and a foot are <u>connected</u> to <u>one human body</u>, each person on earth (represented by hands, feet, etc.) is <u>connected</u> to <u>one body of people</u>. So recognizing that 'hands and feet' are referred to as 'members of the human body', and 'people' are referred to as 'members of the

body or group of humans on earth' - so that the word 'member' has a double meaning - Paul says 'If ONE member suffers, then all the members suffer with it, so that there should be <u>no division in the</u> **body**, and that the members should care for other members **as themselves**' (1 Corinthians 12.25-26). Therefore, if we are all of one body, then when someone sins against you, it is also your sin, and 'to forgive their sin' is to also 'forgive yourself'; recognizing and realizing that 'the person you are judging' could very well be you under different circumstances. Or, as discussed later in Section 9, 'you and/or your traditions' could unknowingly be the cause of someone else's sinning. Jesus says in John 20.23 "If you forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven them; if you retain the sins of any, they are retained". Notice that John 20.23 says 'retain'. 'Retain' means to 'keep possession or ownership of something'. And Jesus said 'retain' because, since 'we are all of one body', then 'the sins of others' already belong to us; i.e., we already have 'ownership of their sins', and it is up to us whether or not we retain them. So if we do not forgive others, we have effectively 'not forgiven ourselves', and are condemned to retain their sins as our own sins. Thus, noting that 'we are all of one body, and the sins of others actually already belong to us', John 20.23 (which is further discussed in Section 10) essentially states 'God's law of forgiveness and judgment' in one breath: 'If you forgive others, you will be forgiven, but if you do not forgive others, God will measure back to you the same measure you used for others' (Matthew 6.14-15 and 7.2). Note that Paul echoes this 'law of God's judgment' and 'the retaining of other's sins as one body' when he says "For in whatever you judge another you condemn yourself" (Romans 2.1); i.e., 'If you condemn others for doing something, you <u>also</u> condemn yourself as doing the <u>same</u> thing' as "We are members of one another" (Ephesians 4.25).

Comparing 'the whole body of God's people' to 'a human body' just as Jesus and Paul frequently did (see Section 2 explanation of 'the eye and the hand that corrupts the whole body'), consider the following parallel. Your 'whole body' goes into a store and 'the hand of your body' steals an item. Can you tell the police 'It was just my hand that stole the item, the rest of me is not responsible... send only my hand to <u>prison</u>'? Of course not. You cannot <u>separate</u> your **hand** from 'the rest of your body'. I.e., 'the rest of your body' is just as responsible as the hand that stole the item. And so just as 'the members of your whole body' (i.e., eyes, ears, feet, etc.) already own or 'retain' the sin of your hand, you, being 'a member of the whole body of God's people', already owns or 'retains' the other person's sins; of course making the comparison that 'you' = 'an eye, ear, or foot', and 'the person who stole the item' = 'a hand'. Therefore 'begging mercy' for your sins - just as the unforgiving servant, and just as Catholics entering the confessional - is not the way forgiveness works. You must choose to forgive the other person's sins if you want to be forgiven. If you do not forgive others, then it is the same as 'not forgiving yourself'; i.e., you will 'retain' their sin because it is also your sin, since 'we are all of one body'. So, if a foot (i.e., you) looks at a hand (i.e., your fellow servant) and condemns it, then, because 'both feet and hands are attached to the same body and cannot be separated', the foot is in essence condemning itself. Therefore, if we are all truly one body, then you cannot look at another person and judge them without in fact judging yourself. You must empathize and understand one another because you may one day find out that 'the person you judged as quilty was actually innocent, while you thought you were innocent, but you were really quilty' (Matthew 7.3). I.e., you were naked but you thought you were <u>clothed</u>. Note that this is the essence of 'how it was possible' for Jesus, 'the innocent', to be condemned

by 'the guilty' religious hierarchy. And so 'God's law of forgiveness and judgment' is designed to produce 'one universal, whole body of people' by promoting equality and empathy, while discouraging supremacy and judgment.

It must be recognized that the Catholic hierarchy will surely say that we must 'cut off the hand' that keeps stealing, as in Matthew 5.30. But, because the Catholic hierarchy - being naked, ignorant, and blind - cannot interpret that 'a hand' as referred to by Jesus in Matthew 5.30 is 'a corrupted religious leader who lusts after Jesus' bride' (see Section 2 for explanation), then unfortunately it is they who are 'the hand'; stealing God's name and speaking lies in His name, thereby stealing God's bride (i.e., His people), and of course committing adultery. And so because 'the corrupt hand of the Catholic hierarchy' 'steals the name of God in order to redefine good and evil for their own supremacy, authority, and glory', and 'condemns all who do not follow them in their blatant acts of adultery against God', 'the whole spiritual body' has in fact been corrupted. By redefining good and evil, the Catholic hierarchy has deceived countless generations into 'judging and beating their fellow servants' (just like Saul), thereby sending 'an unknowing Catholic body of people' to prison alongside 'the corrupt hand of the Catholic hierarchy'. The bad news is that, since 'we are all of one body', we are also all in some way attached to 'the corrupt hand of the Catholic hierarchy'. Thus, if we do not stand up and correct (i.e., 'cut off' from Matthew 5.30) 'the corrupt hand of the Catholic hierarchy', it may end up sending us, the whole body, to an eternal prison.

The problem with the Catholic hierarchy, why they can't see that they are corrupt, is that 'they do not walk into a store and physically steal an item - of course momentarily ignoring their blatant weekly <u>extortion</u> practices in Mass which are justified in Jesus' name - or walk up to someone and physically shoot them'. Therefore, they perceive themselves as being innocent. But they are far from innocent. By teaching their followers to practice 'a supremacy toward other religions that is perceived as being righteous' - which is really a blind religious bigotry - they have ultimately caused a backlash of dissension, which creates hate, and leads people to retaliate and commit crimes of violence, theft, and overall desolation. Ask yourself, 'If a Black American in the southern United States in the 1800s was enslaved, oppressed, and mentally degraded by a white supremacist slave owner, would he not begin to hate and resent his slave owner?' Now because of this hate and resentment, the Black American eventually decides to 'kill his slave owner' and 'steal a horse and food to try and escape captivity'. In this example we can all see why the Black American retaliated. But, since slavery (i.e., supremacy) was legal at the time, and perceived by White Americans as being righteous, the Black American is judged and condemned as being a criminal, while the white supremacist slave owner is judged as being an innocent victim... all while it was the **supremacy** of the white slave owner that Caused the Black American to react with a backlash of dissention. So just like the Catholic hierarchy who does everything 'within the law' (that is, our legal system, not God's legal system) and 'perceives themselves as being innocent while being far from innocent', so too is the slave owner far from innocent, as he is the <u>cause</u> of <u>someone else</u> committing murder and theft; even though the slave owner may have done everything 'within the law'. Notice too that the slave owner will most likely be remembered by his peers as having honor, as if he was 'a martyr dying for the cause of white supremacy', just as Catholic Forefathers who stood up and defended their supremacist practices are now considered 'honorable martyrs' by their modern day

peers. Hence, just as the slave owner and other White Americans in this time period could not see that certain crimes were a backlash to their supremacist mindset, the Catholic hierarchy also can't see that many societal problems are a backlash of dissension to what has trickled down from their teachings of 'religious supremacy' and consequential 'spiritual and emotional enslavement and degradation'; noting that there are many 'hard to trace' manifestations in the human psyche that actually can be traced back to the idolatry of speaking lies in the name of God. And so the Catholic hierarchy, just as the Pharisees and Scribes were, are 'Blind leaders of the blind' because they have no concept of the fact that 'what they do', as righteous as they think they are, is actually the cause of sin; i.e., they have no concept of 'one universal, whole body'. The Catholic hierarchy cannot see that 'the lies they have inherited from their fathers' (Jeremiah 16.19) are the cause of other people's sinning. Hence the Catholic hierarchy also can't see that 'the supreme, exclusive, judgmental, and consequential hypocritical mindset that they have inherited' is the source of their own blindness, ignorance, and nakedness; blindly, ignorantly, and nakedly condemning others for 'what they themselves are actually the cause of'.

Think about it. We can all understand that 'a dog biting someone' is most likely caused by some form of mistreatment. That is, we know the dog is reacting the way he has been trained to react; whether it is because of something **inherited** in **breeding**, or just **abuse**. Now if the owner of the dog is bitten, then we can all realize that it was not so much the dog's fault, but the owner's fault and/or the breeders that came before him who bred the dog to bite. We can all realize that 'the dog's biting' is a symptom of 'what the present owner has done' or 'what breeders before him did'. So while the dog needs to be stopped from biting other people, the owner should realize that 'it is him and his ancestors, so to speak, who <u>caused</u> the dog to bite'. Condemning the dog (i.e., putting him to sleep) without realizing that present owners and past breeders are the cause of the dog's actions will only temporarily fix the problem, as the same thing will continue to happen with other dogs. Likewise, condemning 'people who fight and make war' (i.e., biting dogs) will only temporarily fix the problem. And so people such as the Catholic hierarchy and other religious hierarchies should realize that they - being likened to 'present' abusive owners and past breeders of the dog' - are blindly condemning people who fight and make war, all while being the cause of them fighting and making war in the first place. I.e., these religious hierarchies and their forefathers are like the owner/breeder who trains the dog to bite and abuses the dog, then wonders 'Why did the dog bite me?' As an example, look at the Syrian refugee crisis. Because of Catholicism's hidden influence of unspoken supremacy and exclusion, both past and present - i.e., 'no salvation outside Catholicism' - radical Muslim leaders have created their own trickled down version of <u>Catholicism</u>, saying 'There is no salvation outside Islam and ISIS'; which ultimately is saying 'There is no salvation without the <u>leaders</u> of Islam and ISIS', thereby placing 'themselves and their false man-made beliefs' as 'idols and gods' before the one true God. So because of the idolatry that flourished at the hands of the Catholic Forefathers, we see today unthinkable manifestations of idolatry. And while the Catholic hierarchy, as blind hypocrites, will condemn ISIS for causing countless deaths, desolation, starvation, displacement, etc., it is the past and present idolatrous acts of the Catholic hierarchy - and products of that idolatry, such as the Crusades, in which Catholics and Muslims both fought to defend their own respective false gods - that are ultimately the cause of the Syrian refugee crisis. I.e., it has been the 'breeding practices' of the Catholic Forefathers - and subsequent religious hierarchies

from multiple religions - that have produced the 'biting dogs of ISIS'. The idolatrous acts of the Catholic hierarchy, essentially acting as gods before the one true God, are what have created the unthinkable manifestation of evil that we now see in ISIS; remembering of course from Section 3 that the Catholic hierarchy and their forefathers were the hidden influence or catalyst for unimaginable evil such as 'the wars and countless corpses that were a product of the Reformation, the American Civil War, Hitler's slaughter of the Jews, and the September 11, 2001 World Trade Center terrorist attacks'. Thus, we must be able to look behind 'the actual sinning' in order to identify 'who and what' is the Cause of sinning. True humility is to admit that 'you and your inherited traditions are the cause of someone else's sinning'.

Everyone has been taught that 'Jesus died for our sins', but what does that really mean? The religious leaders (in particular the Catholic hierarchy) say that this means 'Jesus died so that our sins could be forgiven by God'. But they are wrong, and they have distorted Jesus' sole purpose only to satisfy their lust for control and power. Jesus' **sole purpose** was (and still is) to 'eliminate what causes people to blindly sin' (i.e., supremacy or idolatry), not to 'forgive people when they do sin'; noting that Jesus sealed the **New Covenant** to <u>solidify</u> and <u>make known</u> the idea that 'sins are forgiven as we forgive others', not 'as priests perform sacrifices and rituals', as sacrifices and rituals are inherently idolatrous acts of supremacy. If the Catholic hierarchy were right in their assertion that 'Jesus died so that our sins could be forgiven by God', then they would be implying that God did not forgive any sins **before** Jesus died. This of course is **wrong** according to the Old Testament. In **Exodus 34.6-7** God Himself proclaims that 'He forgives sin'. Psalm 99.8 gives God the name "God-Who-Forgives". Additionally Numbers 14.18&19, Psalm 32.5, and Isaiah 38.17 all speak of 'God granting forgiveness for <u>sins'</u> roughly **500** to **1500** years <code>prior to</code> the birth of Christ; with at least <code>David</code> (Psalm 40.6) and <code>Isaiah</code> both saying that 'God does not want sacrifice for forgiveness of sins'. So if people could already be forgiven by God, then Catholicism's assertion that 'Jesus died so that our sins could be forgiven by God' is wrong. We must recognize that, since God 'could and would' already forgive people, then Catholicism's assertion implies that Jesus' death on the cross was unnecessary and somewhat meaningless, thereby also *implying* that God *incompetently* forgot that He was already forgiving people, and hence put His Son through 'hell' for nothing. Remember, Satan places his lies right next to the truth to cause confusion and desolation. Jesus' sole purpose was NOT to 'forgive our sins', but to 'eliminate and remove that which <u>causes</u> us to <u>blindly sin</u>' so that there is a '<u>remission</u>' or 'receding' of sinfulness; think of 'cancer that is in remission', or is receding and diminishing. It is important to realize that 'remission of sins' does not mean 'forgiveness of sins', as Jesus sealed the New Covenant to 'remove idolatry by making the **Old Covenant** and its 'supremacist sacrifices and rituals' (which were thought to be needed for the forgiveness of sin) **obsolete**, thereby facilitating the **remission** (i.e., receding or diminishing) of sinfulness' (Matthew 26.28). And so we must recognize that Jesus used 2 different words, 'forgiveness' and 'remission', to mean 2 different things: forgiveness to describe 'God washing away the sins we actually commit or have committed', and remission to describe 'God's people not even **committing** the sin in the first place'. I.e., 'remission of sins' implies that 'we (as a whole body) will no

longer blindly even commit (macro level) sins, or overall sinfulness will diminish and recede', while 'forgiveness of sins' implies that 'God totally forgets about us actually committing sins'. Ask yourself 'If these 2 words were interchangeable, then why did Jesus not say to the paralytic in Matthew 9.2 'Your sins are in remission or diminishing'?' This gives the implication that 'his (supposed) sins were lessened, but not gone completely', making it obvious - as replacing 'forgiven' with 'in remission' does not make much sense - that Jesus used the 2 different words, 'forgiveness' and 'remission', to mean 2 different things. To believe that 'remission of sins' equals 'forgiveness of sins' is to believe Satan's lie that he has placed right next to the truth to cause confusion. Jesus became a Man and 'took on our sins' - which is basically 'taking on' the sin of 'the condemning of the innocent and the exalting of the quilty' - in order to bring truth into the world so that the source of our sinning could be identified and eliminated, thereby making our sins 'diminish' or 'go into remission'. Jesus, as did <u>all</u> of the Prophets, focused on 'the big picture'; not individual sinning. That is why Jesus says in Matthew 18.7 "Woe to the world because of offenses! For offenses must come, but woe to that man by whom the offense comes!" In other words, Jesus was concerned with the <u>leaders</u> who <u>Caused</u> sinfulness; **not** the actual people who were blindly sinning by following the leaders. Therefore, Jesus was targeting 'the blind leaders of the blind' because they are 'the cause of sinfulness' and 'the reason that sinfulness propagates and even **grows** one generation to the next, thereby not going into **remission**'.

And so Jesus came to 'remove that which <u>causes</u> us to blindly sin' in order to facilitate the <u>remission</u> of sinfulness. And the cause of our sinning is rooted in A) the religious leaders (who are false prophets), B) the religions themselves (which are false gods), and C) all of the man-made temples associated with religion. I.e., the cause of our sinning is the idolatry taught by our religious leaders. Remember that the recurring theme of the entire Old Testament is 'idolatry'. So Jesus came to remove idolatry from the world; which of course makes **idolatry** 'the sin of the world'. As John the Baptist says in John 1.29 "Behold! (There is Jesus) the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world". Notice that 'sin' is singular; it does <u>not</u> say plural 'sins'. **Idolatry** is the one singular sin that is the main cause of offenses (i.e., violence and oppression) to God, and 'Jesus is the Lamb of God who takes away this sin (i.e., idolatry) of the world'. Think about it. What good would it be if Jesus was 'The Lamb of God who forgives the sins of the world'? As already noted by the previous quotes from the Old Testament, God 'could and would' already forgive our sins, so this interpretation by the Catholic Church does not make any sense. Are we to believe that God sacrificed His Son just so we could keep on sinning the way we **always had**, but now God would simply forgive us if we 'asked forgiveness in the name of Jesus'? This Catholic reasoning - that 'grants forgiveness anytime forgiveness is asked in the name of Jesus' **contradicts** the whole premise of Jesus' 'Parable of the Unforgiving Servant' who simply asked forgiveness, yet did not forgive others. This Catholic reasoning makes God out to be <u>naïve</u> and 'a god' who doesn't know the true nature of man. You can be sure that God - just like the King in 'The Parable of the Unforgiving Servant' - has seen a million times over, people who beg mercy and forgiveness, yet blindly and hypocritically turn right around and condemn others for lesser crimes. Think about it. Would God not want to COrrect 'what continually causes people to sin' so that He no longer even has to forgive sins (in a 'large sense' of course)? Wouldn't God want to stop people from blindly sinning, rather

than have them continually ask forgiveness, only to commit the same sin over and over again? Wouldn't God want to <u>prevent sins</u> (such as wars and violence) <u>from occurring in the first place</u>, rather than <u>perpetually forgiving us as we blindly hurt and kill each other</u>? Therefore, in order to <u>prevent</u> sins from occurring in the first place, Jesus was sent to <u>ultimately 'remove what <u>causes</u> people to blindly sin (i.e. idolatry)' so that there is a <u>remission</u> or <u>diminishing</u> of sinfulness. And this 'remission or <u>diminishing</u> of <u>sinfulness'</u> will only occur when <u>Jesus returns</u> to 'take away the sin (i.e., idolatry) of the world'.</u>

We must come to the realization that, if the Catholic hierarchy can <u>teach</u> and convince us that 'Jesus sole purpose was to forgive our sins', and also that 'Jesus will not forgive our sins without the constant intercession of the Catholic hierarchy', then they have set up for themselves a caste system in which they have the top position. I.e., by **teaching** us lies in the name of Christ, the Catholic hierarchy has put themselves in a position of authority and supremacy. And so by distorting Jesus' sole purpose for their own glory and benefit, the Catholic hierarchy has obscured the very essence of the New Covenant (sealed with the blood of Christ) which states 'no more shall false teachers and false mediators, such as the Catholic hierarchy, <u>intercede for God</u>'. I.e., the New Covenant states that 'no one shall teach their friend or tell their neighbor about God', and hence bypasses all of the idolatrous religious leaders to establish a direct relationship between God and His people, with Jesus being the sole Mediator of the New Covenant. Hence Jesus died to seal the New Covenant, with the New Covenant essentially detailing 'the <u>end</u> of idolatry', as it represents 'the <u>end</u> of false prophets (our religious leaders) who <u>teach</u> us to worship their false gods (religions or false personas of God)'. But this 'end of idolatry' will only come at 'the End of the Age' when Jesus returns; see Zechariah 13.2-5 which refers to 'the return of Jesus' and 'the shameful realization by all of our false prophets that they are **naked** and **ignorant**, not perceiving that they are indeed false prophets'. Therefore we must understand that, while 'the <u>sealing</u> of the New Covenant with Jesus' blood' represents 'Jesus taking away the sin (i.e., idolatry) of the world', this 'taking away' was by no means immediate and complete, as the world still, 2000 years later, blindly practices idolatry, thereby blindly committing atrocious acts of violence and oppression in the name of God. We must understand that, while Jesus is 'the **Redeemer** of mankind', mankind is **not yet redeemed**. I.e., Jesus' work on earth Only began 2000 years ago with 'the sowing of the seeds of truth'. Those seeds lay dormant until the Light returns to make them sprout to life, thereby 'removing iniquity from the land in one day' (Zechariah 3.9). And so the world will not understand the true meaning of Jesus' presence on earth until He returns to 'do battle with the Beast at Armageddon', consequently 'removing the sin of idolatry' and bringing about 'the destruction of all the world's temples'. When Jesus returns He will finish what He started 2000 years ago (i.e., 'all will be fulfilled', Matthew 5.18) by 'removing that which causes the world to blindly sin' - religion and all of its false teachers, false prophets, and false mediators - thus bringing about 'a fulfilled New Covenant' and 'the true remission of sin'.

So if Jesus came to 'remove the causes of sin' - as removing the cause of someone sinning also removes the sinning itself - we must stop looking at the people who are 'actually sinning'. We must look behind 'the actual sinning' in order to identify 'who and what' is the cause or source of sinning; as Jesus says 'Woe to the man who is the cause of sin' (Matthew 18.7). If we can identify the cause or source of someone else's sinning, then we may begin to realize that we (and/or our inherited traditions) are in

some way part of **the reason why** someone else is sinning in the first place. We may realize (i.e., 'see our own nakedness and ignorance') that we are 'condemning people while **simultaneously** being <u>the cause</u> of them sinning'. In other words, they are merely a **Symptom** of the disease which we are the **SOURCE of.** You might say, 'How can this be true? I did not sin, they are the sinners'. Remembering that 'we are all **one spiritual body**', consider these few examples.

You might condemn abortion, but you should really be looking for 'the cause' of why someone has an abortion. You must identify the source, or 'the reasons why someone wants an abortion in the first place'. While there are many reasons, the most common are guilt, shame, fear, embarrassment, and social stigma of becoming pregnant out of wedlock. Whether we admit it or not, the social stigma remains that 'the girl who got pregnant is a whore who made a mistake', thereby either silently or openly condemning her for something everyone does. So we must realize that, if we have defined the girl's actions as 'a mistake', she will of course want to hide that mistake. By Satan redefining 'what is <u>clean and unclean</u>, he makes us blindly look down on this girl as if she is a <u>leper</u>; as if she is unclean. This stigma - which originates from Satan and his puppet, the Catholic hierarchy - is transmitted through our religions like a *disease*. Hence, the people who say that 'they pray feverishly for an end to abortion' are actually the ones who are the Cause of many abortions. Remember Jesus says in Matthew 18.7 'Woe to the man who is the <u>cause</u> of offenses'. And so while the girl's abortion is an offense to God, Jesus says 'Woe to the men (our religious leaders) who guilted, shamed, and scared the girl into having the abortion'. I.e., an abortion is merely a SYMPTOM of the disease which our religions (namely Catholicism) are the SOURCE of. Therefore we must ask the question, 'If upon becoming pregnant, young girls felt **joy** instead of the projected **quilt**, **shame**, and **fear** of the Catholic Church and other religions, how many abortions would we eliminate?'

We must come to the realization that the Catholic hierarchy has, for the past two millennia, set the tone for 'what is sexually acceptable' (see Section 16) - which is of course based on a false persona of Christ - and we have all unknowingly inherited their 'warped sense of sexual right and wrong'. Essentially the Catholic hierarchy has instituted an aura of 'uncleanliness' around anything pertaining to sex, therefore not realizing that 'people they have condemned as being <u>unclean</u>' were actually <u>clean</u>; of course making them **blind hypocrites**. We must remember that 'Mary the mother of Jesus became pregnant out of wedlock'. Would the Catholic Church have declared Mary 'an unclean whore' because she was impregnated outside of their man-made institution? What sort of guilt, shame, and fear would the Catholic Church have projected on Mary if they had been around at the time of Jesus' birth? What if Mary had felt enough guilt, shame, and social embarrassment that she decided to have an abortion? Also consider that Jacob had 4 women (2 wives and 2 servants) by which he had 12 sons. These 12 sons would become the 12 Tribes of Israel. If the Catholic Church would have been around in the time of Jacob, you can be certain that they would have 'spoken for God' and condemned Jacob for his actions i.e., condemned him as being unclean - while it seems quite obvious that God approved of Jacob's actions. Additionally we should remember that *David had 2 wives*, and *Abraham had a child by his maid*. Therefore, after realizing that Catholicism would have probably condemned many people in the Bible for their sexuality, we can conclude that 'Catholicism's laws of what is sexually acceptable' are not 'God's

laws of what is sexually acceptable'. And by <u>redefining sexual right and wrong</u> - that is, <u>restraining</u> and <u>demonizing</u> people's natural, God-given <u>sexual</u> ambition and desires - Catholicism and every religion who has learned from Catholicism's misguided teachings, has <u>caused many sexual based offenses such as abortion</u>, <u>rape</u>, and <u>general brutality</u> towards all who do not fit into their definition of 'sexually correct' (see also Section 16).

Here is a <u>2nd example</u> which explores the idea that 'we are blind to the sins of our ancestors which still <u>cause people to sin in our present day</u>'. Imagine if your grandfather stole the intellectual property of a competitor for which he then received a patent. Because of this, the competitor went out of business and was <u>bankrupted</u>, while your grandfather's business <u>thrived</u>. Everyone praised your grandfather as being a genius, while the competitor was beaten down as being a failure. <u>Your grandfather then passed on to your father a successful business and a positive mentality, while the competitor passed on debt and a defeated mentality to his son. By the time we get to your generation, you have inherited a <u>fortune</u>, while the grandson of the competitor is <u>broke</u> and homeless with mental problems. In fact, he <u>steals</u> from the business that you inherited from your father, which was inherited from your grandfather; who of course is the <u>original thief</u> in this example, and the one who <u>stole much more</u> than the homeless man could possibly ever steal.</u>

So the question is 'Who is stealing from who?' Is it possible that this 'homeless bum' is the rightful owner of your business? You condemn him and say 'He is blind because he doesn't know right from wrong'. But, it is really you who is blind (i.e., naked and ignorant) because you can't see that your ancestor is the cause of his thievery, and what he does is a backlash (or response) to the sin of your grandfather. You can't see that your grandfather stole from his grandfather causing a chain reaction that still causes people to sin today. I.e., the cause of the other man's 'supposed' sin is rooted in your family's past sins; remember 'we are all of one body'. Therefore, what you inherited from the past - while you thought it was a righteous inheritance - is actually 'the source' of why that man is stealing today. Or, your **poisoned inheritance** is the **source** of the other grandson's **condition**. Conversely, you must realize that, if your grandfather had 'the idea' that was stolen by his competitor, then YOU would in fact be the 'homeless bum' stealing from the competitor's grandson. Again, the homeless thief is merely a symptom of the disease which your grandfather is the SOURCE of. And so in reality, the sin of the homeless thief is very much your sin, as your family's sins are actually the cause of his sins. But, you cannot see this truth because you are blind to the events of the past, and hypocritically believe that 'you could never be him'. You are blind to the truth that your inheritance is rooted in lies and thievery that began with your grandfather; or, you are blind to your poisoned inheritance. Therefore, if we are blind to our poisoned inheritance, then we may end up blindly and hypocritically condemning others, while we (i.e., 'what we came from' or 'our traditions') are actually the cause or 'the reason why' someone is sinning in the first place. If we cannot 'look inside ourselves and see the other person', we will <u>never</u> truly be **one body**. In fact, we will be <u>divided</u> because Satan has made us judge and condemn others as if 'they are not us' and 'we could never be them'. Thus, the message of Jesus is to empathize and understand 'why someone is the way they are'. You must be willing to say 'Maybe it is I, or what I have inherited from my family or surroundings, that is the reason why that person is the way they are'.

You must understand that, while you are condemning a member of the **whole body**, you may be the member that is **causing** the other member to sin. I.e., your eye telling your hand to steal something is <u>just as guilty</u> as your hand; making it quite obvious why 'retaining the sins of <u>any member of the body</u>, retains them as your own sins' (John 20.23). And so we must come to the realization that the **cause** or 'the reason why' someone else is sinning could be rooted in <u>Our poisoned inheritance</u>.

The Catholic hierarchy condemns nations and groups who make war, yet they - being blind and unknowingly <u>naked</u> and <u>ignorant</u> - cannot see that they are the <u>cause</u> or 'reason why' those same people fight and make war in the first place. Or, more correctly, 'what they have inherited' - a poisoned inheritance that they think is a righteous inheritance - is the cause or 'reason why' nations and groups fight and make war. The idolatrous practices of early Catholicism - their creation of a false idol and false god - caused a chain reaction leading to the creation of other false gods (i.e., religions). In other words, all those who lusted after having their **own** supremacy, **not** wanting to **bow** to the leaders of the <u>Catholic mob</u>, went out and <u>started</u> their <u>own mob</u> (i.e., religion), thereby **not** being a slave to the Catholic hierarchy, but rather **becoming** their own hierarchy with their **own** slaves. And of course once you have 2 opposing and competing mobs, you also have 'division, war, and hate'. Think of the parallel with corporations, and how 'people seeking more power will divide off and start their own corporation that competes with the parent corporation'. And so we can trace our current state of 'warring mobs' back to the idolatrous teachings of Catholicism; which we must remember is merely a mutation, with their many rituals and sacrifices, of 'what Judaism was 2000 years ago'. That is, Catholicism is basically a product of taking 'Judaism 2000 years ago' and then 'placing its idolatrous acts on steroids' by backing those idolatrous acts with 'the name and words of Christ'. And so by stealing the intellectual property of Christ (i.e., His name and His words) and basically 'taking out a patent', as if they own Christ and His words, Catholicism has prospered (just as 'the grandfather who stole the competitor's idea' prospered), thereby appearing to be built on a righteous inheritance, while actually being built on a poisoned inheritance which is the cause of why others are sinning in today's world. Thus the Catholic Church looks at different nations and groups who fight and make war, then judges them saying 'Stop fighting, what's wrong with you'; in effect making them just like the wealthy grandson saying to the grandson on the street 'Why do you steal, what's wrong with you?' The Catholic Church blindly and continually says 'Peace, peace', while simultaneously harboring 'the source of division, war, and hate' - the Eucharist thereby blindly preaching 'a message of false peace'. And so the Catholic Church - being blind to their poisoned inheritance which is rooted in the idolatry of worshiping the Eucharist and its subsequent false teachings about forgiveness and judgment - blindly believes that they are 'the source of true forgiveness and true salvation', while in truth, they are 'the source of false forgiveness (i.e., the Sacrament of Confession) and <u>false</u> salvation' that leads to the supreme, exclusive, hypocritical mindset which is the cause of offenses and the cause of 'division, war, and hate'. I.e., the Catholic Church and all of their idolatrous practices are the SOURCE of the disease which others are merely a SYMPTOM of.

The **hypocrisy** of the Catholic hierarchy - i.e., the way they point the finger at everyone worshipping other gods besides Catholicism, while it is their idolatry that is the <u>cause</u> of so much sinning - is <u>hard to identify</u>. Therefore we must recognize that <u>other manifestations of hypocrisy</u> may also be hard to identify because of **normalization** and *'on the surface'* **literal interpretations** of the Commandments;

noting that Catholicism has instituted many violations of the Commandments by interpreting **literally** or 'on the surface'. Many times a hypocrite puts physical limitations on the Commandments; literally interpreting in order to justify their actions and reassure themselves that 'they abide by the Commandments'. They say 'See I don't murder or steal <u>like</u> that petty thief who robbed a convenience store and shot the clerk'. No, they don't murder or steal like the petty thief, but they have found more socially acceptable and normalized ways of killing and stealing that blend into our society. Some hypocrites 'murder' a competitor's reputation (i.e., slander) in order to 'steal a possible client' for monetary gain, or to 'steal a group of voters' for political gain and power. We punish the petty thief for stealing a pork chop or a loaf of bread (which is really just a <u>backlash</u> or response to other's 'larger' sins), but 'stealing someone's client' by murdering their reputation, or 'stealing a group of voters' by lying about yourself and/or your opponent, is non-regulated and not penalized. Instead of bars and stripes, the thief who stole an idea, a client, people's minds and consciences, glory, etc., actually receives praise and honor. You must realize that 'the grandfather who stole the intellectual property' also received praise and honor, when his actions had far greater ramifications than anything 'the petty thief grandson' could have possibly done; recognizing of course that people in higher positions (the owner of a corporation, a politician, a large contractor, a doctor, etc.) have the ability to plant bad seeds that can span generations and hundreds of years. Therefore we must also recognize that, when we have normalized and actually glorified the slanderer who 'murders and steals' for monetary or influential gain, we make the following generation emulate slanderers who 'murder and steal'; which again implies farther reaching consequences than anything the petty thief could have done. In turn, we slowly and surely construct for ourselves a normalized false society which is based on justified lies and word manipulation; and this is all done in the interest of monetary gain and blind ambition to achieve more power. We slowly and surely create for ourselves a normalized false economy that is based on manipulating people's minds into always wanting and buying things they don't really need; all because we have grown 'accustomed to' and normalized our own lies. We slowly and surely create 'a body of people' who blindly have more interest in monetary and influential gain than humanity itself; i.e., we need to **forget** about the words 'economic impact' if we are to ever bring humanity into a state of true equality, peace, and happiness. Thus by twisting words and redefining the Commandments through **literal interpretation**, people train themselves to be **blind hypocrites**, thinking they follow the Commandments, while violating them worse than others (i.e., the petty thief), thereby making large monetary or influential gains by seemingly lawful methods; which in turn of course causes our next generation to **emulate** this normalized and socially accepted lawlessness, and become for themselves another generation of blind hypocrites who blindly contribute to the desolation of humanity. And the blind hypocrisy that is taught in the Sacrament of Confession - the 'confessing of non-sins' and the 'omitting of real sins' that reinforces a wrong thought pattern of warped, redefined good and evil - is only a stepping stone to countless other manifestations of hypocrisy, which 'on the surface' appear as though they **conform** to the Commandments.

Finally, we must consider <u>how</u> it is that the Catholic hierarchy has been able to make people <u>submit</u> to 'them and their warped version of good and evil' in the **Sacrament of Confession**. Or, what 'instrument' does the Catholic hierarchy '<u>strike</u> and <u>enslave</u> their followers with' that makes them <u>not question A</u>) their necessary position in the chain of salvation, <u>B</u>) their blatant disregard for God's Primary

Commandment, and <u>Cl</u> their systematic **redefining** of good and evil? Catholicism's 'instrument of force' is **fear**. By associating themselves seamlessly with Christ, and saying 'Christ said you will not be forgiven without us' - not to mention presenting us with all of their false interpretations of Scripture to back up their lies - the Catholic hierarchy has instilled in multitudes of people for many generations the **fear** that 'going against them = going against Christ'; which of course is also 'the fear of eternal damnation'. But this could not be farther from the truth, and again why Catholicism's sin of 'blaspheming the Holy Spirit and the taking God's name in vain' is an eternal sin that 'will not be forgiven'; as it is the Cause of unfathomable desolation. Yet, regardless of this sin being so grave, the Catholic hierarchy seems to ignore it, as though it doesn't even exist (i.e., as if it's a non-sin). In doing so, they have, by 'the manipulation of the words of Christ', and subsequent creation of 'the fear of not being forgiven', totally fabricated the Sacrament of Confession, essentially 'playing God' in order to be 'supreme like God'.

And so by creating 'the unrighteous fear of not being forgiven without the Catholic hierarchy', the Catholic hierarchy has consequently been able to easily 'sell their services' to the multitudes.

In any marketing class you will learn that, in order to sell a product or a service, you must first educate people as to 'why they need your product or service over someone else's product or service'. You need to educate them on 'what you can do that no one else can do', thereby creating a demand for your service. What if you educate people to believe that 'you are the only one who can forgive their sins'? By creating a **fear** that 'sins are not forgiven without your intercession', you have just created a **demand** for yourself; i.e., job security through the projection of fear. Or, in other words, if the demand which you have just created is one that can only be satisfied by you - i.e., you are the only supplier then you practically guarantee your own prosperity. Now in the case of the Catholic hierarchy, not only have they convinced us that 'they are the only ones capable of performing the service of forgiving our sins' - i.e., the only 'supplier of forgiveness' - they have in fact created, being the brilliant salesmen that they are, a service that was never needed and is in fact **impossible** to perform anyway; as sins are only truly forgiven when 'the one seeking forgiveness forgives others'. And so 'us being forgiven by God' has nothing to do with a 3rd party priest, and the Catholic hierarchy has interjected themselves as false mediators into 'the method of true forgiveness' only to sell a service that was never needed; which in turn of course grants them unlimited prosperity. What the Catholic hierarchy has done is truly sick and <u>demented</u>. They have essentially (through redefining good and evil) <u>created a fictitious</u> disease, then concocted a Cure (i.e., the Sacrament of Confession) which only they can produce, thus 'cornering the spiritual market' and 'creating a monopoly on salvation'. This is a brilliant and highly effective business strategy, but it is a man-made business strategy that is rooted in greed and lust for control and power. And this is the 'business model' that the Catholic hierarchy has followed for many centuries to 'dominate the spiritual market'.

Think of today's insurance salesman. The more <u>fear</u> and <u>panic</u> that is created, the more they are in <u>demand</u>. Similarly, the Catholic hierarchy thrives on the fear and panic associated with <u>eternal</u> <u>damnation</u>, saying, '<u>Don't you want to be sure that your sins are forgiven</u>?' The more fear and panic they can create - convincing us that 'we are sinful and they can save us' - the more their '<u>false</u> spiritual

protection policies' are in demand. And so the Catholic hierarchy creates the fear and panic that, without 'them and their spiritual protection policy' you may go to hell, just as an insurance salesman says 'Without me and my insurance policy you could lose your house, car, health, etc'. But unlike the insurance salesman who can actually sell true monetary protection, the Catholic hierarchy cannot sell spiritual protection because they are offering something that does not exist. And in essence, they never left the Dark Ages, selling us 'indulgences' and 'tickets to heaven' under the disguise of tithing. The only true spiritual protection that does exist is to simply 'love others as yourself'; any other form of spiritual protection is false. Therefore, the Catholic hierarchy, by offering false absolution and false salvation in the Sacrament of Confession, are in fact frauds who sell fraudulent, false spiritual

protection policies. Remember a false teacher (a fraud) gives your fish, but will not teach you to fish. They want you to need them. They want you to be dependent on them; that is, their products and services. A false teacher rules over you by keeping you uneducated and ignorant. He will not teach you 'how to fish' in order to keep you as his slave. A false teacher wants servants, not friends. But a true teacher teaches you 'how to fish' so 'you do not need him' because he wants friends, not servants. And so the 'how to fish' in question is 'how to be forgiven'. A true teacher sets you free and tells you to 'forgive others if you want to be forgiven'; a true teacher makes you independent. But the false teachers of the Catholic hierarchy keep you a servant under their control by effectively saying 'If you want to be forgiven, we (and we alone) are authorized to grant forgiveness in the Sacrament of Confession so that you are a <u>dependent</u> slave to us'. And they do this of course so that you are <u>forced</u> (by <u>fear</u>) to continue buying their 'fraudulent, false spiritual protection policy' which guarantees their continued prosperity (i.e., control and power). Thus, the test of a true or false teacher is this: whether or not he says 'You **don't** need me for forgiveness and/or salvation' or 'You do need me for forgiveness and/or salvation'. A false teacher (a fraud) will <u>always insist</u> that 'You <u>do</u> need me to be forgiven and/or saved'. A fraudulent false teacher will always insist that you need their 'fraudulent, false spiritual protection policy'.

Jesus 'sold' the only true spiritual protection policy there is: simply 'loving others as yourself'. Therefore, Jesus was the one true Teacher because He taught that 'you do not need all of the false teachers of Judaism for forgiveness and salvation'; that is, when Jesus is physically gone, the only Teacher we need is God. As the New Covenant (Hebrews 8.11) says 'No one shall teach his friend or neighbor about God, for everyone from the least to the greatest will be taught by God'. Hence Jesus taught the truth, or 'how to fish', so that when He left, we would not need the products and services (i.e., the Sacrament of Confession) of any one man or man-made institution; we would be totally independent and autonomous. Jesus taught rules by which we could be self-sufficient, and not be reliant on any other man for salvation. Yet the Catholic hierarchy, just as the Jewish hierarchy before them did with God's words, twisted Jesus' words with their own intentions in order to 'sell their fake cure (i.e., the Sacrament of Confession) to a fictitious disease'; which of course they created in the interest of their own glory and supremacy over the multitudes. Recognizing that the Catholic hierarchy is a mere continuation of 'the Jewish hierarchy of 2000 years ago', Jesus' words to the Pharisees and Scribes still apply to the Catholic hierarchy today. Jesus said, 'They only tie loads (i.e., Catholicism's fictitious disease of non-sins that they claim are real sins, and their fake cure) onto people's backs that

are heavy and hard to carry, yet will not lift a finger to help. They do everything so people can see them, taking the **best seats** at the feasts and in the synagogues. And they love to be exalted as 'teacher'. But you only have one true Teacher, the Christ. And while the Christ is the greatest among you, He is your Servant'. (Matthew 23.3-11). Therefore, the Catholic hierarchy, just as the Jewish hierarchy did, pretends to be true teachers and true servants - as we have only one true Teacher and true Servant - so that they may enjoy the supremacy and honor that is associated with God, teaching us with the Sacrament of Confession to be **dependent on them** as if **they are God**. But, just as it was 'in the beginning with Adam and Eve', their positions as teacher are granted to them **not** by God, but by Satan, who temps with 'the honor of being supreme like God' (Genesis 3.5). And by creating and projecting 'the fear and panic of not being forgiven or receiving salvation without the Sacrament of Confession', the Catholic hierarchy has indeed fallen into Satan's trap, blindly oppressing and enslaving the multitudes with their 'heavy loads of inherited sin'; which of course they cleverly disguise as a righteous blessing. I.e., the Catholic hierarchy sells their enslavement practices (i.e., their fake cure to a fictitious disease) as 'the gift of forgiveness in the Sacrament of Confession'. But it is far from a gift, as the Sacrament of Confession is Satan's clever trap to catch, first the leaders, then their followers, thereby producing an unknowing multitude of **blind hypocrites** who blindly **cause** 'division, war, and hate' in the names of Jesus and God, while truly believing that they stand for 'unity, peace, and love'.

By pretending to be 'teachers ordained by God', false teachers (i.e., our religious leaders) have, for thousands of years, oppressed and enslaved God's people with God's name. For thousands of years, false teachers have created their own man-made laws, disguised them as God's laws, and then enforced those laws by projecting the **fear** and **panic** that 'if people don't conform to the laws of men, then God will condemn them to hell'. As Isaiah 29.13 says 'The unrighteous fear of God is taught by the laws of men'. And of course the easiest way to decipher 'the laws of men' from 'the laws of God' is by identifying if 'the law' grants supremacy and unrighteous authority to 'the men who create the law'. I.e., does the law create a caste system of inequality? And so for thousands of years religious leaders have oppressed and enslaved God's people by setting up 'a caste system in the name of God', which keeps it as a hidden and supposedly righteous caste system, whereby the religious leaders are the only ones who can - according to their own laws - perform 'the services supposedly required by God' that will ensure the people's salvation. And this effectively means that, without the religious leaders to perform sacrifices, say long prayers, conduct ceremonies, etc., the people cannot be saved. In other words, by the religious leaders creating and instilling in people a fear (i.e., Catholicism's fictitious disease) that can only be subsided by them (i.e. Catholicism's fake cure), they have just placed themselves in a position of control and power, essentially saying 'You need us to be saved', thus in fact identifying them as false teachers.

And so, like all the other false teachers before them, the Catholic hierarchy has also 'taught and educated' us in the same 'unrighteous fear of man-made laws' in order to create a demand for services (i.e., the Sacrament of Confession) that only they can provide; which of course places them at the top of the hidden caste system and guarantees their continued power and prosperity. Therefore, the Sacrament of Confession is one of Catholicism's primary man-made laws that the Catholic hierarchy uses to instill in God's people 'a fear of eternal damnation that can only be subsided with their

intervention'; which, by the way, violates the direct relationship between God and his people, as outlined in the New Covenant. The Sacrament of Confession is one of Catholicism's primary man-made laws that the Catholic hierarchy uses to enforce their authority over the minds and consciences of God's people, thereby systematically redefining good and evil in the name of Jesus, and ultimately training those people to become blind supremacist hypocrites who unknowing cause 'division, war, and hate', while thinking and believing that they stand for 'unity, peace, and love'. The Sacrament of Confession is one of Catholicism's primary man-made laws that the Catholic hierarchy uses to 'monopolize salvation' and 'control the spiritual market', thereby also controlling nations in the physical realm. But ultimately the Sacrament of Confession is 'a fraudulent, false spiritual protection policy' sold by fraudulent false teachers who distort and oppose Jesus' sole purpose to 'free us from the enslavement practices of idolatrous men' such as the Catholic hierarchy. Thus, the Sacrament of Confession is one of Catholicism's primary man-made laws that the Catholic hierarchy uses to keep God's people enslaved... but Only until the return of Christ, which will mark our exodus from bondage.

10. Catholicism's False Authority to Forgive Sins

"The truth shall set you free" (John 8.32). The intentions of this line have been grossly misinterpreted by the Catholic hierarchy (and their forefathers) in order to induce a guilt complex that they have used to force people into submitting to them (and Satan) in the Sacrament of Confession. Like many other lines spoken by Christ, this line has been taken **out of context** within its own verse, and actually pertains to the Jews knowing and accepting the truth that their ancestors and present day leaders have inherited lies that keep them (the Jewish people) enslaved. And so contrary to the lies that we have inherited from the Catholic leaders, John 8.32 does not say 'If we tell the truth, then we will be set free'. John 8.31-32 does say "If you accept My (Jesus') word, then you know the truth, and the truth shall set you free"; i.e, 'If we are told the truth and accept the truth, then we will be set free'. Remember that Satan keeps his lies close to the truth. Therefore we must realize that Satan has 'taken the words of Jesus, and made them mean the <u>opposite</u> of Jesus' intentions' in order to '<u>enslave us</u> with what was supposed to free us'. We must realize that it was 'Jesus telling us the truth (pertaining to the enslavement practices of our religious leaders) that would set us free', not 'us telling Jesus the truth'. I.e., to imply that Jesus, in John 8.32, is instructing us to 'tell the truth' - which, as the Catholic hierarchy would assert is 'confessing your sins in the Sacrament of Confession' - does not make any sense because Jesus knew that the people's 'definition of true good and evil' had been skewed by their religious leaders, and thus they would, as Catholics do today, only end up 'confessing non-sins' and 'omitting real sins'. So we must know and understand that 'the truth of Christ (i.e., this truth) will set us free' from the enslavement practice of the Catholic hierarchy which falsely asserts - for their own glory and supremacy - that they have the authority to forgive sins in the Sacrament of Confession. Thus ironically, the Catholic hierarchy has it quite **backwards**. It is <u>not</u> 'us <u>telling</u> a priest our sins that will set us free', but <u>rather</u> it is 'us <u>being</u> told the truth that our priests have sinned (by breaking God's Primary Commandment and New Covenant) that will set us free'. Being told and accepting this truth will 'set us free' from Catholicism's inherited lies of idolatrous supremacy and exclusion which have enslaved us, and consequently the rest of the world, to senseless 'division, war, and hate' for almost 2 millennia.

Ask yourself, 'What does the Catholic hierarchy have to gain by making us submit to their authority in the Sacrament of Confession?' They gain all the glory of being considered 'mediator' between man and God. They gain the glory of having man's forgiveness, and consequential salvation, depend solely on them. I.e., they gain the glory of being 'man's only lifeline between himself and God'. But, they gain all this glory based on 'their own authority', not the authority of Jesus or God. In John 7.18 Jesus says "Those who speak on their own authority are trying to gain glory for themselves". In the Dark Ages, the Catholic hierarchy, speaking on their own authority (not the authority of Jesus), used 'the glory of being sole mediator between man and God' - a title reserved for Christ alone - to secure 'absolute power'; the total and absolute rule over government, technology, religion, art, music, and personal liberty. As a result, this 'absolute power and tyranny' gave rise to 'oppression and serfdom' - i.e., not just spiritual enslavement, but physical enslavement as well - which are ultimately the precursors of dissension and revolution; or 'division, war, and hate'. Living in free America we have forgotten why they formed this country, but it was to retaliate against the absolute reign of the Catholic Church and the Church of

England (which at the time was merely a <u>carbon copy</u> of Catholicism), and their abuses of power that they <u>justified</u> in the name of Christ; with these abuses stemming of course from ideas such as '<u>divine</u> <u>right</u>', and the idea that 'any opposition to King or clergyman was seen as <u>a sin against God</u>'. And so if the churches did not rule with direct authority, they would impose rule <u>indirectly</u> as <u>hidden kings</u> under a King or Queen, <u>influencing</u> their minds and consciences. Regardless, the <u>Sacrament of Confession</u>—which embodies <u>the Catholic Church's false authority to forgive sins</u>, and consequential false ability to provide salvation - helped <u>secure the Catholic hierarchy's absolute control and power over the nations</u> in both the <u>physical</u> and <u>spiritual</u> realms by establishing themselves as 'man's only lifeline between himself and God'. Thus Catholicism's authority to forgive sins and provide salvation is 'an authority spoken on their <u>own behalf</u> for their <u>own glory</u>'. Consequently, <u>Catholicism's authority is false</u>, and is <u>not</u> given to them by God, but rather by Satan, who has been <u>using them</u> to cause <u>worldwide desolation</u> in the names of Jesus and God for many centuries.

While the Catholic hierarchy will agree that Satan is the Arrogant One, they cannot see that 'by arrogantly placing themselves, as men, between us and God', they have in fact fallen into Satan's clever trap, thereby developing a god complex just like Satan. Satan is the first being to develop a god complex, as he wants to be perceived as having the power and authority of God. Isaiah 14.16-17 says "Those who see you (Lucifer) will gaze at you and consider you saying 'Is this the man who made the earth tremble, who shook kingdoms and who made the world". In other words, Satan wants all the glory of 'being supreme like the Most High' (Isaiah 14.14), and his jealous envy of God's creation drives him to trick people into bowing to his authority (thinking that it's God's authority) so that they unknowingly do Satan's will while thinking it is God's will, eventually causing people to 'blindly fight and kill each other in the name of God'. The Catholic hierarchy, by lusting after the power and authority of God, has also developed a god complex like Satan, thereby also tricking the multitudes into 'bowing to their authority' as if it is 'God's authority'; which ultimately means that, as the Catholic hierarchy is unknowingly serving Satan, the multitudes are bowing to the will of Satan as well... and they don't even realize it. As Jeremiah 5.31 says, "The priests rule by their own power; and My (God's) people love to have it so".

So we must understand that Satan tempts - from 'Adam and Eve' to 'Jesus in the desert' - with 'the temptation of being supreme like God to others', exercising power and authority over others, on any level small or great, just as God has supreme power and authority. But the power and authority that Satan grants is false power and false authority. That is, Satan grants false power and false authority in the name of God - remembering that Satan disguised his voice as God's voice to Jesus in the desert - so that it is he (Satan) who runs the nations in the hidden realm; not the ones bowing to Satan's will, naïvely thinking that they have true power and true authority. Satan pretends to give authority, but it is false authority in order to 'use those who bowed to him as unknowing puppets'. If you do Satan's will, he will make you think that you have authority from God, but in reality you are really Satan's slave; his puppet and his pawn. And so Satan tricks people who envy Jesus' and God's glory and supremacy; i.e., Satan tricks all of our religious leaders who have a god complex, wanting to 'play God' and 'be supreme like the Most High'. To these people who want to 'play God', Satan pretends

to 'bestow the honor of being granted authority from God and/or Jesus', but it is actually a false honor, and a trap of enslavement by his cunning lies. It is a trap so that Satan may rule the multitudes using 'the Ones granted the false honor' as his puppets. You must realize that Satan, disguising his voice as God in the desert, tempted Jesus with this same 'false honor of being granted authority' (Luke 4.5-8); although Jesus knew that it was a false honor which was not actually from God. Likewise, Satan, disguising his voice as Jesus, tempted the Catholic Forefathers with 'the false honor of being granted the <u>authority</u> of God to forgive sins'; which ultimately is 'the authority over man's salvation'. And of course the Catholic Forefathers fell for Satan's temptation, assuming Satan's god complex, and assuming their positions as 'false mediators (i.e., false christs) between man and God', arrogantly claiming (just as their father, the Arrogant One) that 'There is no salvation without us, the Catholic <u>hierarchy</u>'. Thus the Catholic hierarchy's <u>false authority to forgive sins</u> is a *false honor* granted by Satan - using of course 'the name and words of Jesus' - in order to create a multitude of blind hypocrites who unknowingly <u>cause</u> 'division, war, and hate', while **truly believing** that they stand for 'unity, peace, and love'. And so the Catholic hierarchy thinks they have had 'the honor of authority' bestowed upon them in the **Sacrament of Confession**, but it is actually **false authority** so that <u>Satan may use them as his</u> <u>puppets</u> - as he has for almost 2 millennia - to cause **desolation** among the nations from 'behind the scenes'. The following proves that 'the Catholic Forefathers (or anyone including the Apostles themselves) were **never granted** the authority to forgive sins by Jesus'.

The Catholic hierarchy makes the assertion that 'they have received <u>from Jesus</u> the **power** and **authority** to <u>forgive sins</u> in the Sacrament of Confession'. And they base this assertion on <u>2 main gospel passages</u>.

In <u>Matthew 16.19</u> Jesus says "I will give you (Peter) the <u>keys</u> of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you <u>bind</u> on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you <u>loose</u> on earth will be loosed in heaven".

Then in <u>John 20.22-23</u>, "Jesus breathed on them (the Apostles), and said to them, 'Receive the Holy Spirit. If you <u>forgive</u> the sins of any, they are forgiven them; if you <u>retain</u> the sins of any, they are retained".

There is a <u>fundamental difference</u> between 'the way a <u>false teacher</u> will interpret these verses' and 'the way a <u>true teacher</u> will interpret these verses'. A <u>false teacher</u> reads these passages and says '<u>I own the keys to heaven</u>. Everyone who wants to get into heaven has to bow to me and my authority as <u>if I am God'</u>. A false teacher will 'give you a fish' if you come to him every week and bow to him as a <u>servant</u>. And so a false teacher reads these passages and says '<u>You need me</u>, and you are <u>dependent</u> on me for salvation, therefore I am <u>superior</u> to you'. But a <u>true teacher</u> reads these passages and says '<u>This is knowledge of the truth</u> that will allow <u>me</u> to enter the kingdom of heaven. <u>If I learn this knowledge, I can pass it on to others so that they may also enter the kingdom of heaven</u>. I can teach <u>friends</u> 'to fish' so that they will be <u>self-sustaining and independent of me</u>'. A true teacher does not use this knowledge to acquire servants. And so a true teacher says '<u>You don't need me</u> for salvation because I am <u>equal</u> to you'.

The Catholic hierarchy are the false teachers who purposefully misinterpret 'keys' as 'a device that keeps people dependent on them for salvation'. And so they have remained, because of their pride and vanity, ignorant of the true meaning of 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven'. The true meaning of 'keys' is simply 'knowledge'. In Luke 11.52 Jesus says "Woe to you (false) Teacher of the Law. For you have taken away the key of knowledge. You did not enter in (to the kingdom of heaven) yourselves, and those who were entering in you hindered". So remembering that Jesus spoke using parables and figurative language, He is revealing to us in Luke 11.52 that:

'the \underline{keys} to the kingdom of heaven in Matthew 16.19' = 'the $\underline{knowledge}$ to enter into the kingdom of heaven'.

I.e., the true meaning of 'keys' is simply 'knowledge'. But just like all arrogant people in positions of authority, the false teachers of the Catholic Church 'hold knowledge and information from their subordinates' in order to always 'retain the upper hand'; that is, they 'take away the key of knowledge'. They change the rules as needed to 'make subordinates appear as ignorant' and to 'maintain a position of superiority'; which of course is totally contradictory to Jesus' message of equality. Thus, the false teachers of the Catholic hierarchy have done just the same as the (false) Teachers of the Law in Luke 11.52, holding knowledge and information from people that would allow them to enter into the kingdom of heaven, only so the Catholic hierarchy can maintain their position of authority and superiority. So while the Catholic hierarchy claims that Matthew 16.19 grants them 'the keys of authority', Luke 11.52 makes it clear that 'keys' = 'knowledge', not 'authority'.

At the beginning of each of the previous 2 main gospel passages it reads, "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven" and "Jesus breathed on them, and said to them, 'Receive the Holy Spirit'". To receive either the 'keys' or the 'Holy Spirit', is to receive true understanding or knowledge. The knowledge you receive, by the 'keys' or the 'Holy Spirit', is the knowledge that 'we are all one body of people' and consequently 'we all share in each other's sins'. Hence, the receiving of 'keys' or the 'Holy Spirit' is the receiving of knowledge, not authority. To receive this knowledge is to truly understand that by 'retaining or binding' other's sins, you have 'retained or bound' them as your own, because 'we are all one body of people'. Likewise, by 'forgiving or loosing' other's sins, you have 'forgiven or loosed' your own sins, because 'we are all one body of people'. Remember, in Section 9 the parallel between 'a human body' and 'one body of people' was discussed, with Jesus and Paul frequently using these same parallels in Matthew 5.27-30, Luke 11.34-36, Luke 22.19 (the Last Supper), 1 Corinthians 12.12-30, and Ephesians 5.30. And so if you (as 'an eye, ear, foot, or any other member of the body') condemn another person ('a hand') - that is, 'retain or bind' their sins - then you 'retain or bind' those sins as your own, since 'you and the other person (i.e., member)' are all part of one body of people. Consider if 'your eye tells your hand to steal an item'. Is not your eye just as guilty as your hand? And would you not forgive your own hand knowing that it cannot be separated from 'your whole body'? As Paul says in Ephesians 5.29, "For no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes it and cherishes it". Hence, John 20.23 is saying 'retaining (i.e., binding) the sins of any member of the body, retains them as your own sins'. And to

'forgive (i.e., loose) the sins of <u>any member of the body</u>, is to forgive yourself'. To have this <u>knowledge</u> is to have truly received 'the <u>keys</u> of the kingdom of heaven' and 'the <u>Holy Spirit</u>'.

Thus, these two main passages (Matthew 16.19 and John 20.22-23) used by the Catholic hierarchy to assert their own authority, do not impart authority to the Apostles or anyone, but do impart 'the true **knowledge** of forgiveness and judgment'. It is important to understand that these 2 particular passages are not just a statement of 'how you are to be forgiven', but are more of a statement of God's method of judgment and punishment if you do not forgive; i.e., Matthew 16.19 and John 20.22-23 COMbine forgiveness and judgment into one teaching. And so 'the same judgment and punishment that you place on others' will be placed on you, because 'we are all one body of people'. As Paul says in Romans 2.1, "For in whatever you judge another you condemn yourself". This is the true knowledge or 'keys to heaven' that Peter and the Apostles received and were to pass on to the next generation. This is the 'foundational teaching' or 'rock' (Matthew 16.18) that Jesus' spiritual church is built on. Anyone who puts into practice this "key of knowledge" also has 'keys to the gates of heaven'; i.e., 'the keys' do not belong exclusively to Peter, or any Pope. Furthermore, it is no small coincidence that Peter does mention 'receiving knowledge' from Jesus at least 7 times in his 2nd epistle (2 Peter 1.2,3,5,6,&8, 2.20, and 3.18), but never once mentions 'receiving the keys of heaven or authority' from Jesus; noting that, to the contrary Peter warns of practicing authority or 'lordship' over the flock (1 Peter 5.3). Knowledge is freedom, and ignorance is slavery. Believing that Peter actually received 'keys of authority' from Jesus - that were then passed down to every Pope in the Catholic Church - is man-made **ignorance** that men of the Catholic hierarchy have used for nearly 2 millennia to enslave God's people. But the truth of Christ that 'we are forgiven aside from the unrighteous lordship and authority imposed by the Catholic hierarchy' is true knowledge that leads to true equality and true freedom. The truth of Christ that 'we are all one body of people, forgiving others to forgive ourselves, and taking on other's sins if we don't forgive', is "the key of knowledge" that opens 'the gates of heaven'. And this is the only authority that rules 'those who have truly received the keys and the Holy Spirit'.

Additionally, we must ask the question, 'How is it possible to interpret that Peter received 'the authority to make laws for God', when immediately after (i.e., 3 verses after) the supposed granting of 'the keys' to Peter in Matthew 16.19, Peter spoke for Satan and did not even know it?' Satan's lies are so cunning that not even Peter could fathom that he was actually speaking for Satan in verse 22 by insisting that 'Jesus not be crucified'. Jesus responded to Peter in verse 23 saying, "Get behind Me Satan! You (i.e., Peter) are not mindful of the things of God, but the things of men". And so we must recognize that the Catholic hierarchy has claimed for 2 thousand years that they have 'received the keys of authority from Peter', and then 'made laws in Peter's name', when Jesus Himself says that 'Peter is not mindful of the things of God'. This once again portrays Jesus as double minded and contradictory, effectively saying to Peter, 'Here are keys that will allow you (Peter) to speak laws infallibly in My (Jesus') name, yet you (Peter) don't even realize that you speak the will of Satan'. And so the Catholic hierarchy's claim that 'they own Peter's keys to heaven based on Matthew 16.19' does not make any sense when placed in context of its surrounding verses. The simple fact is that Peter never made laws in Jesus' name because

he was fully aware of Satan's cunning, <u>mind manipulating tricks</u>; as he found out from Jesus in verse 23. Unfortunately the Catholic hierarchy underestimates Satan's deceptive ability, and they have spoken the lies of Satan, not even knowing it. They <u>negate</u> the possibility that they have been tricked by the Spirit of Error (disguised of course as the Holy Spirit), even knowing that John says pointedly, '<u>The people that</u> <u>went out from the Apostles themselves were antichrists</u> who were following the Spirit of Error' (1 John 2.18-19). Thus, the Catholic hierarchy has <u>rewritten the identity of Peter</u> and spoken lies in his name, creating and following doctrine that Peter would have <u>never</u> followed himself, and basing their authority to do so on 'lies spoken by Satan: the Antichrist and the Spirit of Error'. Consequently, they have blindly become 'the <u>antichrists</u> that were <u>from</u> the Apostles, but <u>not of</u> the Apostles'. One of the Catholic hierarchy's greatest barriers to seeing this truth is to recognize that they have <u>spent a lifetime</u> <u>associating</u> themselves with Peter and the Apostles, when in fact, if the Apostles lived today, they would actually be 'enemies (antichrists) of the Apostles', practicing supremacy in the name of '<u>a Peter that</u> <u>never existed</u>', and consequently using 'keys of authority that also never existed'.

It is important to understand that 'the keys of knowledge given to Peter' represented a certain equality and <u>empathy</u> towards others, while 'the keys of <u>authority</u> that the Catholic hierarchy lays claim to' represent a certain supremacy and judgment towards others; meaning the Catholic hierarchy's misinterpretation of 'keys' blatantly violates 'the equality of Jesus' teaching' and 'the equality written into the New Covenant'. Peter even acknowledges this equality, saying that 'He received the Same Holy Spirit that the heathen Gentiles received', and 'God made no distinction between the Apostles and the Gentiles' (Acts 11.17 and 15.9). Hence, Peter was placing himself on the same level as everyone else, and clarifying that he did not receive anything exclusive from the Holy Spirit; which obviously <u>contradicts</u> the Catholic hierarchy's assertion that 'they received <u>exclusive abilities</u> from the Holy Spirit in John 20.22-23 and special keys in Matthew 16.19'. The only 'keys' that Peter received was the **'knowledge from the Holy Spirit'** that 'if you forgive others, you will receive forgiveness, and if you do not forgive others, you will not be forgiven, and you will be condemned for your sins and the sins of others that you would not forgive' (Matthew 6.14-15, Matthew 7.2, and Romans 2.1). This is the 'knowledge of the Holy Spirit' or 'key' that each and every person can use equally (i.e., its non-exclusive to any one person) to 'open the gates of heaven'; metaphorically speaking of course. So again, 'keys' = <u>'knowledge'</u>, not 'authority'. And since it is obvious that the Catholic hierarchy has <u>no true</u> knowledge of forgiveness and judgment - that is, they have 'no clothing', or are naked and ignorant - it is also obvious that they have no keys, and 'any keys' that they claim to have are 'false keys of man-<u>made knowledge'</u>, just as any 'garments' they claim to have are mere 'fig leaves' that they have sewn together in an attempt to cover over their nakedness and ignorance.

To further establish the <u>non-exclusive</u> nature of 'Peter and the Apostles' receiving 'keys' or the 'Holy Spirit', it will help to examine the <u>pronoun 'You'</u> in order to show that 'Jesus' teaching on <u>forgiveness</u> and <u>judgment</u> in **Matthew 16.19 and John 20.23**' applies <u>equally</u> to <u>everyone</u>; **not** just the Apostles. And so the following analysis of the <u>pronoun 'you</u>' will show that <u>A)</u> the pronoun '<u>you</u>' is meant to <u>represent 'any one person'</u> (and <u>not exclusively</u> the Apostles), and consequently <u>B) the 1st half John 20.23 is actually the <u>same identical message</u> as <u>Matthew 6.14</u>; 'forgive others to receive <u>true</u> forgiveness'. I.e.,</u>

John 20.23 does <u>not</u> grant the Catholic hierarchy authority to forgive sins, but rather states that 'anyone (including the Apostles) seeking forgiveness should simply forgive others'. Note that the pronoun 'you', as it represents 'any one person', applies <u>equally</u> to Matthew 16.19, and <u>Matthew 16.19</u> is <u>also</u> <u>essentially the same message as Matthew 6.14</u>, but the *language* of John 20.23 is *closer* to Matthew 6.14, so it is being used in order to <u>more easily identify</u> their identical nature. The Catholic hierarchy will assert that John 20.23 and Matthew 6.14 are <u>2 different</u> teachings on forgiveness. But by saying this, the Catholic hierarchy also asserts that Jesus gave 'one teaching on forgiveness to one group', and 'a <u>different</u> teaching on forgiveness to another group'; which is <u>simply impossible</u>, because 'the <u>same</u> mind of Jesus' could <u>not</u> teach <u>2 opposing messages</u>. 'Satan's double mind' is the only mind that teaches 2 opposing messages; and that is ultimately what he has taught to the Catholic hierarchy to make them <u>believe</u> that they have had 'the honor of authority to forgive sins' bestowed upon them. But in reality, John 20.23 is identical to 'Jesus' <u>other</u> teachings on forgiveness', and Satan has merely tricked the Catholic hierarchy so that they have become his blind puppets who blindly cause <u>division</u> and <u>confusion</u> with misinterpretations which are rooted in their lust to have 'the supreme authority and glory of God'.

Thus, the pronoun 'you' is the 'keyword' to understanding that Jesus was imparting knowledge, not authority to the Apostles in John 20.23; recognizing that 'you' is in fact indefinite, not definite. The pronoun 'you' can be used in 2 very different cases. Webster's dictionary defines these 2 cases as 11 <u>'you' = 'the definite person</u> or persons spoken to', or <u>2)</u> <u>'you' = 'an indefinite person</u> in general or an indefinite group of people in general'. The example given in Webster's dictionary for the 2nd case is 'You never can tell' or 'You never know'. In fact, most of the Bible speaks in terms of 'you' as being 'an indefinite person in general or an indefinite group of people in general'. Notice, in Exodus chapter 20, the 10 Commandments say "'You' shall have no other gods before Me, 'You' shall not murder, and 'You' shall not steal". Was Moses talking just to 'the people physically in front of him', or did he imply 'anyone' when he said 'you'? The truth is that we all know Moses meant to include 'everyone and anyone' when he said 'you'. I.e., the 10 Commandments apply to 'everyone and anyone'. Additionally, Jesus uses 'your whole body' in Matthew 5.27-30, where the 'you' = 'a body of people'. That is 'you' = 'an indefinite group of people in general' in Matthew 5.27-30. The 'you' used in all these cases is an 'indefinite you', meaning that it applies to 'any ONE person or group' and not 'a specific person or group'. Therefore, when 'you' = 'an indefinite group of people in general', that 'indefinite you' can be substituted with the pronoun 'everyone' or 'anyone'. Likewise, when 'you' = 'an indefinite person in general', that 'indefinite <u>you'</u> can be <u>substituted</u> with the pronoun 'one'; noting that Webster's also lists 'one' as a definition for 'you'. Think about it. If this was not the case, then we would not have to abide by the 10 Commandments because Moses only meant for the 10 Commandments to apply to 'the actual or definite persons spoken to' when he said 'you'. And so we must realize that most all teachings in the Bible would be worthless if 'you' were defined as a 'definite you'.

To no surprise the Catholic hierarchy **interprets** the pronoun 'you' as 'the definite persons spoken to', when it is to their advantage, authoritatively to do so. That is, whenever there is any opportunity for the Catholic hierarchy to 'assume the supremacy of God over others', they will interpret 'you' as applying to 'only the Apostles' (who they mistakenly think they have descended from) so that they may <u>iustify</u>

their <u>unrighteous authority</u> over the multitudes. Look at the following verses where the Catholic hierarchy has made a <u>distinction</u> between a <u>'definite</u> you' and an <u>'indefinite</u> you'.

"If 'you' forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven them" (John 20.23).

"If '<u>you'</u> forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you" (<u>Matthew 6.14</u>).

The Catholic hierarchy - in order to secure for Satan control and power over the minds and consciences of God's people - has reasoned in their favor by saying 'you' in John 20.23 is a 'definite you' that was meant 'only to apply to the Apostles'. If we interpret Matthew 6.14 using the same deductive reasoning as the Catholic hierarchy, then 'the Matthew 6.14 you' would only apply to 'Jesus' disciples and the other people (see Matthew 5.1 and 7.28) who physically followed Jesus up the mountain'; implying that Jesus was only addressing a 'definite you' in Matthew 6.14. And, if this were true, then 'Jesus' New Testament teachings on forgiveness' are worthless to us, as we were not physically on the mountain with Jesus. I.e., we (which would include everyone on earth) are exempt from 'forgiving men their trespasses' because Jesus was 'obviously' - according to Catholic logic and reason - using the pronoun 'you' as 'only the definite persons spoken to on the mountain'. And so just as it is complete nonsense to interpret 'you' in Matthew 6.14 as a 'definite you', it is also complete nonsense for the Catholic hierarchy to interpret 'you' in John 20.23 as a 'definite you'; especially when you consider that their interpretation coincidentally places them in a power position of supremacy. Think about a scenario where John 20.23 had actually said 'If you forgive the sins of any, then you must be their Servant for 1 year'. Do you think the Catholic hierarchy - who assert with a double tongue that they are 'already' our servants - would lay claim to being the supposed 'definite you' in John 20.23 anymore? Absolutely not; which only proves their lust to be 'supreme like the Most High'.

By the Catholic hierarchy implying that Jesus used 2 different cases of 'you' when teaching about 'being forgiven', then they also imply that Jesus spoke with a double tongue. This is the same 'Catholic implication' that was made when Jesus said 'food does not go into your heart', and then supposedly turned right around to tell us that the Eucharist is somehow 'food that goes into our heart'. And so by using <u>2 different cases of 'you'</u>, Jesus would <u>in effect</u> be saying '<u>YES, your sins are forgiven</u> if you <u>forgive</u> others' (Matthew 6.14), but 'NO, your sins are NOT forgiven if you forgive others; they are only forgiven if an Apostle forgives your sins' (the Catholic hierarchy's asserted meaning of John 20.23). Why would Jesus say 'you' as being 'any one indefinite person' in Matthew 6.14, then turn right around in John 20.23 and say 'you' is only 'the definite Apostles'; both in the context of forgiving others? To do so is double minded, or not from the same mind. The Catholic interpretation of John 20.23 implies that Jesus was an incompetent, inconsistent Teacher who could not remember that He had already given a **different** teaching on forgiveness to another group. The Catholic interpretation portrays Jesus as Someone who contradicts Himself. And, the reason their interpretation does this, is because they did not receive their interpretation from Jesus, but rather from Satan's double tongue, which has made the Catholic hierarchy blindly break God's Primary Commandment by practicing unrighteous supremacy over the multitudes. So by believing Satan's double tongue misinterpretations - i.e., by using 2 different cases of the pronoun 'you', and interpreting 'you' as 'the definite you of the Catholic hierarchy' - the Catholic Church has assumed exclusive and unrighteous authority over God's people. But unfortunately

it is a <u>false authority</u>, and a <u>false honor</u> bestowed upon the Catholic hierarchy, <u>not</u> by Jesus or <u>God</u>, but by Satan. Thus, the fact is that <u>both</u> of the previous verses (John 20.23 and Matthew 6.14) containing 'you', are speaking to an 'indefinite person' or 'indefinite group' - not a 'specific person or group' such as the Catholic hierarchy - and the <u>original intention</u> of the pronoun 'you' had to have been an 'indefinite you', <u>otherwise these 2 verses contradict each other</u> (i.e., are double minded); and Satan is the only one who contradicts himself, <u>not</u> Jesus.

Think about it. By Catholicism asserting that Jesus used <u>2 different cases of 'you'</u> when teaching about forgiveness, they are essentially stating that there are <u>2 different 'methods of forgiveness'</u>: the <u>1st method</u> of simply 'forgiving others' in Matthew 6.14, and the <u>2nd method</u> of 'supposedly <u>only</u> being forgiven by the Apostles and their <u>supposed</u> descendants, the Catholic hierarchy'; which is the Catholic hierarchy's **asserted** meaning of John 20.23.

The <u>1st method</u> (i.e., Matthew 6.14): <u>A</u>) is <u>indisputable</u>, as Jesus states this method on a number of other occasions such as Matthew 6.12, Matthew 18.35, Mark 11.25, Luke 6.37, and Luke 11.4, <u>B</u>) is <u>not clouded</u> by <u>unclear pronouns</u>, <u>C</u>) sets up a system of forgiveness that is <u>independent of man</u>, and therefore <u>supports</u> the entire premise of the <u>New Covenant</u>, which states <u>dependence on NO man</u> for salvation, and <u>D</u>) produces <u>equality</u> by <u>eliminating</u> the 'hidden caste system' which relies on religious leaders for salvation.

The <u>2nd method</u> (i.e., John 20.23 <u>according to</u> the Catholic hierarchy): <u>A</u>) is <u>highly disputable</u>, <u>B</u>) is <u>clouded</u> by <u>unclear pronouns</u>, <u>C</u>) sets up a system of forgiveness that is <u>dependent on man</u> and subject to man-made *corruptibility*, therefore <u>violating</u> the entire premise of the <u>New Covenant</u>, which states <u>dependence on NO man</u> for salvation, and <u>D</u>) produces <u>supremacy</u> by <u>propagating</u> the <u>'hidden caste system'</u> which relies on religious leaders for salvation. This 'hidden caste system' rewards all who bow to the will of the religious leaders, as if they are 'of God', thereby producing a multitude of <u>unknowing supremacists</u>.

Thus, since the 2nd method clearly violates Jesus' message of equality (i.e., 'The Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard', and 'The Parable of the Prodigal Son'), and the equality and independence of the New Covenant itself, it is quite obvious that Catholicism's 2nd method of forgiveness is a **false method** that has been 'added on to' the true teaching of Christ in the sole interest of their own supremacy, glory, and authority.

By analyzing the <u>pronouns</u> in John 20.23, and then comparing it with Matthew 6.14, the pronouns become <u>unclouded</u>, <u>revealing</u> that <u>John 20.23</u> and <u>Matthew 6.14</u> are in fact <u>identical methods</u> of being <u>forgiven</u>, and thus verifying that there is in fact <u>only ONE</u> true method of forgiveness - simply 'forgiving others' - with Catholicism's **2**nd method of forgiveness in the Sacrament of Confession being a <u>false</u> method of forgiveness. When Jesus says "If you forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven them" in the <u>1</u>st <u>half John 20.23</u>, the pronoun 'you' is meant to represent 'one or anyone', not just 'you Apostles alone'. If you - i.e., 'you' being 'an <u>indefinite reader</u>' - rewrite John 20.23 with its true intention, <u>substituting</u> 'one' for 'you', it would read, '<u>If</u> 'one' (you) forgives the sins of someone else, their sins (they) will also

be forgiven **them** (the person forgiving or 'one'). It is key to note that, since 'we are all one body of people', retaining and bearing the sins of others that we choose not to forgive, the pronoun 'they' = 'the sins of the other person' + 'the sins of the one forgiving'. It's like saying 'If you forgive others, you are forgiven of what the other person did'; which consequently implies 'being forgiven of your own sins' as well. So while 'they' in John 20.23 appears on the surface to mean 'the sins of the other person', it actually means 'the other person's sins that are loosed or released from the person who is doing the forgiving', as 'we are one body of people'. Thus, in equation format, John 20.23 is translated as follows.

John 20.23

John 20.23 (translated)

If <u>you</u> forgive the sins of any, <u>they</u> are forgiven <u>them</u>. If <u>one</u> forgives the sins of someone else, <u>their sins</u> will also be forgiven <u>them</u>.

This true interpretation (i.e., John 20.23 <u>translated</u>) now aligns with Matthew 6.14; 'If 'one' forgives men their trespasses, 'one's' heavenly Father will also forgive them". Notice how rewriting Matthew 6.14 with 'one', you would naturally say 'them' as the last <u>pronoun</u> of the verse, which corresponds to the 'them' at the end of the 1st half of John 20.23. This clarifies that the pronoun 'them' in 'they are forgiven them' is referring to 'the <u>person</u> who is <u>doing the forgiving</u>', not 'the <u>person</u> who has <u>asked</u> forgiveness and received false absolution from a Catholic priest'. Thus, by A) identifying that the 'you' in John 20.23 is an 'indefinite you', and then B) clarifying the meaning of the pronoun 'they', and that the pronoun 'them' is referring to 'the person <u>doing</u> the forgiving', it becomes quite obvious that the 'you' in John 20.23 is the same 'you' as in Matthew 6.14 - an indefinite person or group, not a specific person or group such as the Apostles - hence <u>verifying</u> that there was, and still is, only <u>One method of true</u> forgiveness: 'simply forgiving others'. To stress the <u>identical nature</u> of John 20.23 and Matthew 6.14, and that there is only <u>one</u> method of true forgiveness, they are <u>rewritten</u> below in equation format.

John 20.23 (translated)

Matthew 6.14

If <u>one</u> forgives
the sins of someone else,
their sins will also be forgiven them.

If <u>one</u> forgives
men their trespasses,
one's heavenly Father will also forgive them.

Recognizing that the 1st half of John 20.23 and Matthew 6.14 are <u>identical</u>, let's turn back to the <u>2 main original passages</u> used by the Catholic hierarchy which they **misinterpret**, thereby 'claiming the authority to forgive sins'. The 'full verse' of John 20.23 and Matthew 16.19 are both verses that state a <u>combination</u> of both 'forgiveness and judgment' in one breath. The 1st half of John 20.23 (i.e., forgive), and the 2nd of Matthew 16.19 (i.e., loose) state 'means of forgiveness', and correspond to Matthew 6.14. The 2nd half of John 20.23 (i.e., retain), and the 1st half of Matthew 16.19 (i.e., bind) state 'means of judgment'. It is important to know that these latter two halves imply 'the judgment that is the effect of not forgiving others'; i.e., you 'retain' or 'bind' those sins of others that you do not forgive. To clarify, the 2nd half of John 20.23 (i.e., retain), and the 1st half of Matthew 16.19 (i.e., bind) do not state anything about 'not forgiving' (i.e., 'not forgiving' is implied), rather they state the penalty for 'not forgiving', which is the 'retaining' or 'binding' of others sins to yourself; noting that 'retaining and binding' is

discussed in detail later in this Section. And so these two latter halves **correspond** to <u>Matthew 6.15</u> (i.e., 'not forgiving'), and <u>Matthew 7.2</u> (i.e., 'being condemning for that which you condemned others for'). Additionally, once it is recognized that John 20.23 and Matthew 16.19 are a statement of how <u>everyone</u> receives <u>forgiveness</u> and is to be <u>judged</u> - i.e., they do not state how the Catholic hierarchy forgives and judges us - it becomes obvious that these 2 main passages <u>restate Jesus' core teachings in Matthew</u> (6.14-15, 7.1-2, 7.12, 18.35, and 6.12 the 'Our Father'), <u>Mark</u> (4.24 and 11.25-26), and <u>Luke</u> (6.37-38 and 11.4 the 'Our Father'). The <u>parallels</u> between John 20.23, Matthew 16.19, and Matthew 6.14-15 (with Matthew 7.2) are as follows in equation format; noting that the 'you' in Matthew 16.19 is an 'indefinite you', just as in John 20.23, and that the **order** of Matthew 16.19 is <u>reversed</u> for clarity.

Forgiveness

(John 20.23) If you <u>forgive</u> the sins of any, they are <u>forgiven</u> them.

=

(Matt 16.19) Whatever you <u>loose</u> on earth will be loosed in heaven.

=

(Matt 6.14-15) If you <u>forgive men</u> their trespasses, your heavenly Father will <u>also forgive you</u>.

<u>Judgment</u>

If you <u>retain</u> the sins of any, they are retained.

=

Whatever you <u>bind</u> on earth will be bound in heaven.

=

But if you <u>do not forgive men</u> their trespasses, <u>neither</u> will your Father <u>forgive your trespasses</u>. (Matt 7.2) For the <u>measure you use</u> (to <u>judge</u>) it will be <u>measured back to you</u>.

Combined with the 2 quotes from Matthew on 'forgiveness and judgment' (6.14-15 and 7.2), and keeping in mind that A) 'we are all of one body' and share in each other's sins, and consequently B) 'retaining' and 'binding' implies the judgment (or the 'effect') that is caused by 'not forgiving other's sins' (which is discussed in detail further in Section 10), the true interpretation of John 20.23 and Matthew 16.19 would read:

Forgiveness

If you <u>forgive</u> the sins of any,
or let <u>loose</u> anyone's sins on earth,
then God will <u>also forgive your sins</u>,
or your sins will be <u>let loose</u>
because <u>forgiving others</u> means to
forgive yourself since 'we are all of one body'.

<u>Judgment</u>

If you <u>retain</u> the sins of any,
or <u>bind</u> anyone's sins on earth,
then God will <u>not</u> forgive <u>your</u> sins,
and your judgment <u>for them</u> will be <u>bound on you</u>
because <u>condemning others</u> means to
<u>condemn yourself</u> since 'we are all of one body'.

You must recognize that by <u>forgiving</u> or <u>loosing</u> other's sins, you not only <u>loose</u> or release your own sins, but you <u>also loose</u> from yourself 'the <u>sins of others</u> that you already, whether knowingly or unknowingly, have <u>possession of</u>'; as we are 'one body of people'. And by <u>not forgiving</u> other's sins, you not only <u>bind</u> or retain your own sins, but you <u>also bind</u> to yourself 'the <u>sins of others</u> that you already, whether knowingly or unknowingly, have <u>possession of</u>'; as we are 'one body of people'. This means that you will be <u>condemned</u> for 'the sins of others that you would not forgive', and Satan will be allowed to 'bear

false witness against you', condemning you for 'what they did' or 'what you think they did'; implying your knowledge of good and evil has been redefined by Satan. This method of judgment is in effect 'measuring back to you what you measured for them' (Matthew 7.2). You will be held accountable for their sins, because 'their sins are your sins', as 'we are all one body of people'. That is, by condemning 'a hand', you (as 'an eye or a foot') also condemn yourself by your own judgment. The 'Golden Rule' says 'Whatever you want done unto you, do unto others' (Matthew 7.12). Thus the Golden Rule quite simply states **God's method of judgment**. I.e., 'you will receive the same condemnation as you gave to others' = 'you will have done unto you as you would have done unto others'. Or as Obadiah 1.15 says "As you have done, it shall be done to you. Your reprisal shall return upon your head." So what you perceive is the sin and punishment of others, is the exact same sin and punishment that you will be condemned for. This means that the Catholic hierarchy, as they perceive everyone not worshipping their false idol (i.e., the Eucharist) will be condemned to eternal damnation, will themselves be condemned as idolaters to eternal damnation. Furthermore, Paul reiterates this 'law of judgment' in Romans 2.1: "For in whatever you judge another you condemn yourself". I.e., you will be condemned for that which you condemn others for. If you condemn someone as a thief, you will be condemned as a thief. If you condemn someone as a pornographer, you will be condemned as a pornographer. If you condemn someone as an adulterer, you will be condemned as an adulterer, and so on; remembering that you may blindly be 'a greater thief, pornographer, or adulterer', not understanding that 'true pornography in the eyes of God' = 'false images of Jesus and God', and 'true adultery in the eyes of God' = 'playing the harlot with Satan by speaking lies in the name of God'. But, if you quite simply look at others remembering that Satan has redefined true right and true wrong - and say 'Maybe they only have a speck in their eye, while I may have a plank in my eye' (Matthew 7.3), then you will be judged as though 'you only have a speck in your eye, while you may truly have a plank in your eye'. I.e., 'you will be judged with the same measure that you judged others with'.

Furthermore, it is **impossible** to misuse the 'law of judgment' to **justify** whatever you want. If you say 'I don't condemn others for stealing, so I can steal whatever I want', in order to think that 'you won't be condemned for stealing', then you have misinterpreted the 'law of judgment'. By this reasoning, you are really saying 'It is righteous to steal', and you will therefore have things stolen from you, and you must judge 'the person who stole from you' as being righteous; which you most likely will not want to do. I.e., since Matthew 7.2 says "For with what judgment you judge, you will be judged", then if you judge that 'stealing is harmless and innocuous', then you won't mind having things perpetually stolen from you, right? So 'not condemning someone' should not be confused with 'condoning or agreeing with what someone has done'. 'Not condemning someone' is a statement of understanding and empathy; a statement of understanding that 'you don't know their circumstances and their justification for what they've done'. The difference is that you may consider stealing a crime, yet you do not condemn others for stealing, not to justify your own stealing, but because you empathize with them, realizing of course that, since Satan is a master at **redefining** good and evil, it may actually be **you** who is **unknowingly** the greater thief; also noting that you may be **blindly** disapproving of someone who is actually righteous. Thus, by not condemning the petty thief, you will not be condemned for greater crimes of blind thievery. But by saying 'Stealing is not a crime' in order to think that you won't be judged for stealing,

then you have 'approved stealing to be done unto you'; which no one really wants 'done unto them'. To further clarify, consider this example. You do not approve of abortion, yet you do not condemn the woman having an abortion - knowing that someone else (i.e., our religious leaders) may be the reason why she is having the abortion - and if you were to condone abortion (murder), then you are effectively saying 'I don't care if someone murders my child'. Therefore, 'not condemning' should not be confused with 'condoning or approving', because if you approve of what someone is doing, then you approve of it being 'done unto you'; which you may or may not want. Ultimately, you are your own judge.

Additionally, it must be addressed how the Catholic hierarchy misinterprets the 2nd half of John 20.23. The Catholic hierarchy incorrectly interprets "If you retain the sins of any, they are retained", as receiving the power from Jesus to 'refuse' a penitent's confession, or 'refuse' a penitent absolution. The problem is that the two words 'retain' and 'refuse' are not equal and interchangeable, but are rather somewhat opposites by definition. I.e., retain = keeping something you already own, while refuse = declining to accept ownership of something. And so they are opposites in that 'retain' implies 'having ownership', while 'refuse' implies 'NOT having ownership'. But, the Catholic interpretation falsely asserts that the words 'retain' and 'refuse' have equal and interchangeable meaning, thereby defiling the verse's original intention from 'a teaching on humility' to 'a **false** bestowing of the authority to refuse the forgiveness of someone's sins as if you were God'. Jesus is using the word 'retain' because He is implying that you are already in ownership of someone else's sins because 'we are all one body of people'. And consequently, 'retention of their sins' is 'the effect' caused by 'the refusal to forgive their sins'. You can't have 'an effect before a cause' or 'an effect at the same time as a cause'. It is a sequence of events in which you cannot change the order of succession. 1st you understand that we all own each other's sins as members of one body of people. 2nd you <u>refuse to forgive</u> their sins. And 3rd you <u>retain</u> their sins as your own, because to 'refuse to forgive their sins' is to 'retain or bind their sins to yourself' as you **already own** their sins because 'we all belong to the same body of people'. Again, 'retention of their sins' is 'the effect' caused by 'the refusal to forgive their sins'. They are not equal and interchangeable, but they are related as 'a cause and effect relationship', of which the sequence or order cannot be changed.

Here is a simple example of sequence of events. If you say 'I <u>fell</u> out of a tree and <u>broke</u> my leg', the <u>falling</u> had to come <u>before</u> the <u>broken leg</u>. 'The fall' was the <u>cause</u>, and 'the break' was the <u>effect</u>. You cannot have 'the broken leg' before (or even at the same time as) 'the fall'. And so just as 'the fall' comes before 'the broken leg', 'the <u>refusal</u> to forgive sins' comes before 'the <u>retention</u> of sins'. And so 'refuse' and 'retain' <u>cannot</u> be interchangeable words because 'refusing' is the <u>cause</u>, and 'retaining' is the <u>effect</u>. I.e., 'the retaining of sins' is the <u>consequence</u> of 'refusing to forgive sins', just like 'breaking a leg' is the <u>consequence</u> of 'falling out of a tree'. Thus, <u>to equate the 2 words 'refuse'</u> and 'retain' is <u>incorrect</u>; especially when, in this case, to replace 'retain' with 'refuse' gives a <u>totally opposite</u> intention of Jesus' original intention. Again, there is a correlation between the 2 words as 'a cause and effect', but one does not 'mean' the other. To use the same example of 'falling out of a tree', Webster's dictionary defines <u>falling</u> as 'to <u>descend</u> freely by the force of gravity', and <u>breaking</u> as 'to <u>separate</u> into parts, usually violently'. If you were to make the argument that 'words describing a cause and effect

relationship' were interchangeable words, then that would be like saying 'to descend' is the same as 'to separate'; which is obviously nonsense. Likewise, you cannot say that 'to refuse' is the same as 'to retain'; they are not interchangeable. And by making them interchangeable, you make the 2nd half of John 20.23 mean the opposite of its original intention, effectively saying 'The other person's sins are not forgiven', when in reality 'it is your sins (the one refusing) that are not forgiven'. And so 'retaining' is the effect of 'refusing'; not the same thing as 'refusing'. To use them interchangeably is to defile the intentions of Jesus' words from 'a teaching on humility' to 'a false bestowing of the authority to refuse the forgiveness of someone's sins as if you were God'.

The correctly interpreted line of the 2nd half of John 20.23 **parallels** the 1st half of Matthew 16.19. I.e., "If you retain the sins of any (on earth), they are retained (in heaven by God)" = "Whatever (sins) you bind on earth will be bound in heaven (by God)". In other words, if you do not forgive the sins of anyone on earth, then those sins will be kept (retained or bound) as your sins in heaven by God. It is important to understand that Jesus 'left off' the understood cause of 'the retention of sins' or 'the binding of sins'; which of course is 'refusing to forgive others' or 'refusing to loose the sins of others'. I.e., 'Retaining' and 'binding' implies the judgment (or the effect) that is Caused by not forgiving.

Therefore, knowing that the 2nd half of John 20.23 parallels the 1st half of Matthew 16.19, and that 'retaining' and 'binding' are the understood effect of 'not forgiving others', the true meaning of these 2 lines in equation format is as follows.

2nd half of John 20.23

If you retain the sins of any, they are retained.

=

2nd half of John 20.23 (translated)

If you 'do not forgive the sins of any member of the body on earth' (i.e., the cause), then you have retained the sins of any member of the body on earth, therefore 'their sins are retained as your sins in heaven by God' (i.e., the effect).

&

1st half of Matthew 16.19

Whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven.

=

1st half of Matthew 16.19 (translated)

'Whatever sins of other members of the body that you <u>do not forgive</u> on earth' (i.e., the <u>cause</u>) are the sins that you bind on earth, and are therefore '<u>the sins that will be bound as your sins</u> in heaven by God' (i.e., the <u>effect</u>).

And so it is of utmost <u>importance</u> to recognize that Jesus was actually <u>Warning the Apostles</u> that 'if they did <u>not forgive</u> others, <u>they themselves</u> would <u>retain</u>, or be <u>bound</u> to the other person's sins'. And if you <u>replace</u> the word 'retain' or 'bind' with the words 'refuse to forgive' (as Catholicism asserts), Jesus' original intention becomes **skewed** and **defiled** from 'a teaching on humility' to 'a false bestowing of authority'. Thus, Jesus was <u>not</u> instructing the Apostles to 'refuse absolution', as the Catholic hierarchy

will assert; of course making their interpretation of the **2**nd half of John 20.23 and the **1**st half of Matthew 16.19 totally backwards from Jesus' true intentions.

The fact that Jesus was actually 'warning the Apostles to always forgive' becomes obvious when you consider the COntext of Matthew 18.18 - "Whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth will be loosed in heaven" - which is an identical quote to Matthew **16.19**. Immediately after Matthew 18.18, Peter asked Jesus 'How many times should I forgive my brother?' Jesus responds by saying 'Forgive your brother up to 70×7' - which is essentially like saying 'Forgive your brother indefinitely' - then proceeds to warn the Apostles about 'refusing to forgive others' by telling them 'The Parable of the Unforgiving Servant'. The main idea of this parable is summed up in Matthew 18.35 when Jesus says 'God will do unto you (i.e., throw you in prison and have you tortured) as you did to your fellow servant if you do not forgive your fellow servant'. So now we must ask, 'If Jesus was instructing the Apostles to 'refuse to forgive others' or 'refuse absolution' - as the Catholic hierarchy asserts is what is meant by 'binding' in Matthew 18.18 - then Why would Jesus immediately tell the Apostles to A) forgive your brother indefinitely (i.e., 70×7)', and then B) tell a whole parable about 'a man who received the same penalty as what he measured out to others because he did not forgive others"? If we are to believe Catholicism's interpretations, then 'in context', Jesus was speaking blatant contradictions. Think about it. If Catholicism's interpretations - that 'binding and retaining' means 'refusing to forgive' or 'refusing absolution' - were correct, then would Jesus not have said 'But after 70×7, then you may refuse to forgive others'? Would Jesus not have told a parable in which 'The servant was right not to forgive his fellow servant'? And so nothing about the Catholic hierarchy's assertion of being granted 'keys of authority to NOT forgive sins in Matthew 16.19 and 18.18' makes any sense when put into context. They are essentially claiming, once again, that Jesus speaks with a double tongue like Satan. In simplest terms, they are essentially *claiming* that Jesus said 'You <u>may</u> <u>refuse</u> to forgive others (yes), but <u>don't refuse</u> to forgive others (no)'; which is a <u>total nonsense</u> contradiction that Catholicism has received from Satan, not Jesus. Thus, in context, it is clear that the Catholic hierarchy's assertion that 'they may refuse absolution' is totally opposite of Jesus' intentions; which consequently reinforces the idea that John 20.23, Matthew 16.19, and Matthew 18.18 are all warnings to the Apostles (as well as anyone and everyone) to 'always forgive others' and 'never refuse to forgive others'. On the side, notice that Matthew 18.18 (as opposed to Matthew 16.19) is spoken to multiple disciples (see Matthew 18.1), and **not** just to Peter, indicating again that 'the keys to heaven' were not just offered to Peter alone, but to <u>any</u> and <u>all</u> who simply 'forgive others'.

Another <u>contradiction</u> should be mentioned between the Catholic interpretation of John 20.22-23 and the true interpretation of John 20.22-23. The Catholic hierarchy claims that, *'once Jesus breathed the Holy Spirit on the Apostles'*, they were <u>imparted</u> with *'the power and authority to forgive sins'*. It should be noted that Catholic priests are <u>not true descendents</u> of the Apostles, but simply for argument sake, we will entertain their assertion in order to refute the more basic assertion that *'even the Apostles were not given the authority to forgive sins'*. So as *'supposed descendents of the Apostles'*, Catholicism asserts that a priest is the <u>only one</u> who can forgive sins. But by saying that *'the imparting of the Holy Spirit'* grants the <u>exclusive ability</u> to forgive sins, the Catholic hierarchy <u>contradicts itself</u>, as <u>their own</u>

Sacrament of Confirmation is the supposed imparting of the Holy Spirit by the Bishop. In other words, if 'the receiving of the Holy Spirit' is the prerequisite for the ability to forgive sins, then every Catholic who has been confirmed can forgive sins just as a priest. But surely the Catholic hierarchy will say 'No, that is a special type of Holy Spirit (i.e., the Sacrament of Holy Orders) which is only granted to the chosen ones'. Again they speak with a double tongue. They have in effect created 2 Holy Spirits. A 'super' Holy Spirit for delivering special power and authority to 'the chosen ones', and a second 'common' Holy Spirit for the rest of us 'not so-special, non-chosen ones'. How can we be sure that the Holy Spirit they say we receive at Confirmation is not <u>the same</u> as the Holy Spirit the Apostles received? They can't be sure, and beyond that, they don't really even know 'who has received' or 'who has not received' the Holy Spirit; only God knows. Even Peter, the 'supposed' (according to Catholic doctrine) first Pope of the Catholic Church, states that "It is clear that **God gave** those Gentiles the same gift (of the Holy Spirit) that He gave us (the Apostles)" (Acts 11.17). Here Peter recognizes his equality with 'the heathen Gentiles' and expresses that "God gave" the Holy Spirit to the Gentiles. I.e., Peter did **not** give the Holy Spirit to the Gentiles - of course meaning that the Catholic hierarchy does not give the Holy Spirit in confirmation - and 'the Holy Spirit that Peter received' was identical to 'the Holy Spirit that the Gentiles received'. So if the Pope (as he claims) is the descendant of Peter, and we are (in the worst-case scenario) descendants of 'the heathen Gentiles', then we all have 'the same Holy Spirit', as Peter makes clear in Acts 11.17. Thus, if the Catholic hierarchy claims that 'the receiving of the Holy Spirit - as stated in John 20.22-23 - is the prerequisite to forgive sins', then every Catholic on the planet can forgive sins the same as a Catholic priest; of course removing any and all exclusive abilities and authority claimed by the Catholic hierarchy. This basic analysis of the Catholic doctrine easily proves it to be *flawed* and 'of the doctrine of men, not God'. And so again, to 'receive the Holy Spirit' is to 'receive knowledge', not authority of any kind; including 'the authority to forgive sins'.

Quite ironically, the one true method of forgiveness - simply 'forgiving others to be forgiven by God' - is repeated by multitudes of Catholics and Christians alike every week in Mass (or in similar Protestant church services) when they recite the 'Our Father' prayer. But since Catholicism has placed their false method of forgiveness right next to the one true method, people blindly stumble right over the truth every week, not even knowing the meaning behind what they are saying. Note that Protestantism has their own 'watered-down false method of forgiveness' in which they 'recite a prayer (i.e., a spell) in the name of Christ, and ask Him to forgive them', just as the unforgiving servant begged forgiveness while negating that 'true forgiveness only comes by forgiving others'. And so it is quite ironic that in fact 2 of Jesus' most important laws are contained in the 'Our Father': "Hallowed be Thy name" and "Forgive us our sins as we forgive others" (Matthew 6.9-12). By reciting these laws over and over again every week in Mass, the Catholic hierarchy 'plays the fool', essentially admitting that they know the true law of God, and then blatantly breaking the law of God. To clarify, Jesus says 1st, God's name is hallowed and basically unspeakable for our protection, not to satisfy God's ego. Whoever speaks His name creates a false persona of God, which eventually leads to false, man-made laws (i.e., the Sacrament of Confession) that are not from God. The Catholic hierarchy and their forefathers have blatantly 'spoken God's name in vain', not keeping His name hallowed, thereby passing, from one generation to the next, man-made laws that have been used by Satan to enslave God's people. 2nd, our sins are forgiven as we

<u>forgive others</u>. If we do not forgive others, our sins are <u>not</u> forgiven, regardless of how many times we receive absolution from a priest, begging forgiveness just as the unforgiving servant. By setting up a **false method** of forgiveness, the Catholic hierarchy has <u>blatantly disregarded</u> God's **true method** of forgiveness, thereby creating multitudes of unforgiving servants. Thus by <u>not</u> keeping God's name hallowed, the Catholic hierarchy has made up their own 'false law of forgiveness' in the Sacrament of Confession, thereby canceling out <u>God's true law</u> - which we repeat every week in the 'Our Father' - that states 'we are forgiven as we forgive others', NOT 'as we go to Confession'.

If a Catholic priest declares someone forgiven (or 'grants absolution'), yet that person has not forgiven others, he has actually done more harm to that person than before they walked into the confessional; essentially granting false absolution. And by granting false absolution, the priest has consequently reinforced that person's wrong thought pattern as being right. I.e., the person still has prejudices against others - or 'real sins' that they think are 'non-sins' - but since the priest told them that they were forgiven, it reinforces in that person's mind that they are right; it reinforces that 'God approves of a thought pattern that He actually doesn't approve of'. And so, the priest has done a disservice, not a service, to his fellow man and God. The priest has given that person a false sense of security just like selling them bogus 'spiritual insurance'. Therefore, being sincerely sorry, just like the unforgiving servant, will do you no good in the eyes of God; you must 'forgive in your heart', not 'be sorry in your heart', to be forgiven. As Jesus notes in 'The Parable of the Unforgiving Servant', there is a big difference between the two. 'Sorry' means 'you want to be forgiven', 'forgiving others' means 'you are forgiven'.

It is also important to note that 'you <u>do not</u> have to be <u>forgiven by everyone</u> that <u>you have sinned</u> <u>against</u>'. That is impossible and <u>not</u> necessary. To listen to such things is to listen to the enslavement practices of Satan. What you must do is 'forgive the people who have sinned <u>against you</u>' and then move on. By doing so, you recognize that 'the people sinning against you' are just like the person you 'once were', 'still are', or 'could be'. God is simply telling you that 'to be forgiven by Him, don't be a hypocrite'. Realize that you 'could have been', or 'were', or 'still are' the same person as 'the person sinning against you'. Asking someone else to forgive you, and then them saying 'I forgive you' might make you feel better - just as false absolution makes people feel better - but you are still just like the 'unforgiving servant' if you do not forgive others. You're not truly forgiven by God unless 'you do the forgiving'; hearing that <u>someone else forgives you</u> really only means that 'they are forgiven of their sins'. Thus, God is simply asking for 'us to do the forgiving', not have everyone else forgive us.

In the previous example, the priest granted false absolution to a penitent because he was an *'unforgiving penitent'*. But what about the people who go to confession and <u>have actually forgiven others from their heart</u>? Just as the priest granted <u>false absolution</u> to someone who had not forgiven others, in this case the priest is granting <u>unnecessary absolution</u>. They have placed an unnecessary <u>burden</u> or <u>load</u> on someone (see Matthew 23.4) who has forgiven others. They have projected <u>guilt</u> on something that A) has already been forgiven, or B) <u>was never a sin in the first place</u>. Hence, the priest's <u>absolution</u> is <u>unnecessary</u>; not to mention unrighteous. The following expands <u>1</u>st on *'the idea of false absolution and the development of a supremacy complex'*, and then <u>2</u>nd on *'the idea of unnecessary absolution and the development of a quilt complex'*.

When a priest grants absolution for sins to 'an unforgiving penitent' it is actually false absolution; the forgiveness of sins that he is not authorized to grant. Why is he not authorized? According to Jesus' teaching, the only way for you to be forgiven, is to forgive others. The only way for one human to know if another human has forgiven others is to 'know their thoughts'. If a priest does not know someone's thoughts, how can he grant forgiveness? Thus any forgiveness he grants is false. The Catholic hierarchy might say 'We are following Jesus' example'. Maybe so, but they are not Jesus. As it says in Matthew 9.4-6, "But Jesus, knowing their (the Scribes and Pharisees) thoughts said... 'the Son of Man has power on earth to forgive sins". So, until the Catholic priests 'know people's thoughts', they will not be like "the Son of Man who has power on earth to forgive sins". It must be noted that Matthew says that 'Jesus knew their thoughts', but Jesus never claimed to 'know their thoughts'. Thus Matthew may have meant that 'Jesus knew their intentions because He knew the reputation of the Scribes and Pharisees'; just as you might guess a person's stance on an issue based on their affiliation with a particular political party. Regardless, this one instance, where Jesus tells the paralytic 'Your sins are forgiven', is actually more of a statement of Jesus saying that 'just because the man was paralyzed, it does not mean that he was a sinner (i.e., that God has cursed him)', as was 'what they believed' in that day; noting that in John 9.1-3, Jesus' disciples also thought that 'the blind man (or at least his parents) must have sinned, otherwise he would not be blind'. But Jesus says that 'neither the blind man nor his parents sinned'. And so ultimately Jesus, by telling the paralytic 'Your sins are forgiven, rise and walk', was making a statement to the Scribes and Pharisees that 'physical ailments were not a measure of one's sinfulness', as the Scribes and Pharisees may have appeared to be physically well, yet were the greatest sinners, speaking lies in the name of God. And so, just as it was with the Scribes and Pharisees, so the same is true with the Catholic hierarchy, appearing as being (spiritually) well and ultimately as healers, when actually being the ones 'spreading the disease' by granting 'unforgiven people' false absolution, thereby causing them to go out and beat their fellow servants, while thinking it is right to do so.

Just as with the unforgiving servant, this 'reinforcement of a wrong thought pattern through false absolution' breeds a supremacy complex; i.e., false absolution creates a supremacy complex. This was the general idea that Jesus was conveying to 'the Jews as a whole' by telling them 'The Parable of the Unforgiving Servant'. Through their rituals, ceremonies, and sacrifices, they believed that they were forgiven and righteous. But as a result, they developed a supremacy complex (much like Catholicism as a whole), treating others as last and themselves as first, and ultimately beating their fellow servants (i.e., the Gentiles, and anyone who did not submit to the Jewish customs, such as Jesus). Remember, Saul, having 'a wrong supreme and exclusive mindset' that was reinforced as being 'a righteous mindset' based on compliance with the Jewish customs, went out and 'beat and murdered' his fellow servants... all while 'thinking he was providing a service to God' (John 16.2). Obviously Saul had 'a plank in his eye while thinking it was a speck'. Likewise many Catholics (and consequently many people of other religions) also, due to 'false absolution' and 'the reinforcing of wrong thought patterns', have the same 'plank in their eye' which they think, in the worst case scenario, is only 'a speck'. Again, the priest is doing many a great disservice by 'reinforcing a wrong thought pattern through false absolution'; which is merely a Catholic custom just like the Jewish customs that Saul abided by. Thus the *forgiveness* of the Catholic Church is **not** the forgiveness of God, and through their systematic **reinforcing** of wrong

thought patterns, they have created a multitude of <u>unknowing **supremacists**</u> who think (<u>just like Saul</u>) that their supremacy is righteous; noting also that, if false absolution does not create a supremacy complex, it will, at the very least, produce great <u>division</u> and <u>confusion</u> in the mind and conscience of a penitent in terms of 'salvation among <u>other religions</u>'.

People who go to confession and continually ask forgiveness, while the whole time they are <u>already</u> forgiven because 'they have forgiven others', are receiving unnecessary absolution. By coercing people into pleading guilty when they A) have 'forgiven others' and are therefore innocent, or B) are confessing 'non-sins' that they have been led to believe (through 'Catholicism's redefinition of good and evil') are 'real sins', the Catholic Church and its leaders instill in innocent people, through unnecessary absolution, a guilt complex. That is, if false absolution breeds a supremacy complex, then unnecessary absolution breeds a quilt complex. Innocent people, who hold nothing against others, are essentially having their consciences enslaved, being told that 'they are sinful' when they are not, thereby developing a guilt complex. By doing this, the Catholic hierarchy is essentially reinforcing a right thought pattern as being wrong, and making people feel guilty about absolutely nothing. If you think this is impossible, remember that Jesus too was told that 'He was quilty' while doing absolutely nothing wrong. And so because of Catholicism's poisoned inheritance in which they - just as the Jewish hierarchy of Jesus' day have received a 'warped version of good and evil', countless generations have carried the guilt of not being forgiven, when they were actually forgiven the whole time. Countless generations, through having a right thought pattern reinforced as being wrong, have sought unnecessary absolution, resulting in multitudes of people feeling guilty about absolutely nothing, and thereby developing a guilt complex. Remember, Satan is a master at redefining good and evil, thereby making 'the guilty (who think they are innocent) condemn the true innocent' and 'the true innocent feel quilty about doing nothing wrong'. As Isaiah 5.20-21 says "Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil; who put darkness for light, and light for darkness". Thus, the Sacrament of Confession has reinforced some people's 'wrong thoughts as right' through false absolution, and other people's 'right' thoughts as wrong' through unnecessary absolution, thereby making the guilty and self-righteous become more self-righteous through the development of a supremacy complex, and the innocent and humble become more humble through the development of a **guilt complex**.

It is important to note that <u>A</u>) in all the instances where Jesus taught on forgiveness, He <u>never once</u> said to 'confess your sins to Him or His Apostles to be forgiven', and <u>B</u>) in the entire New Testament, there is <u>not one account</u> of 'any Apostle forgiving sins or even offering to forgive someone's sins'. Why? Quite simply, because it is <u>not Jesus' teaching</u>, but rather it is the teaching of the Catholic Church to maintain their unrighteous authority over people's minds and consciences. <u>If</u> this was Jesus' teaching, then who better to confess your sins to than Jesus or His Apostles in person? Jesus could've told them to do so if He wanted to, but He didn't. The Catholic hierarchy will no doubt respond by saying, 'since Jesus already knew their thoughts, they did not have to confess directly to Him'. And that is exactly the point. If the Catholic hierarchy truly believes that Jesus already knows our thoughts, why would we confess to a priest? The Catholic hierarchy surely recognizes that God knows our thoughts, and Jesus likewise agrees in Matthew 6.8. Thus, Jesus did <u>not</u> have the people confess to Him because it is **not** His

<u>teaching on forgiveness</u>; it is the Catholic hierarchy's teaching that guarantees, through 'the systematic <u>redefinition</u> of good and evil', their control and authority in the spiritual realm. Jesus' teaching is <u>simple</u>; 'forgive others to be forgiven by God'.

Additionally, the Catholic Church tries to *downplay* that the <u>Sacrament of Confession did not start until the Middle Ages</u>. If this <u>was truly</u> Jesus' teaching, it <u>would have been in practice from 'day one'</u> while Jesus and His Apostles were alive. But it wasn't, as there is not <u>one</u> instance of any of the Apostles 'forgiving sins' in the entire New Testament. The advent of modern day <u>Confession probably started around the same period</u> as the <u>Catholic Inquisitions</u> of the <u>Dark Ages</u>. What better way to exercise absolute power than for the Catholic hierarchy to insist that 'you tell them (who they conveniently claim is <u>really Jesus</u>) everything and anything that may <u>challenge</u> their authority' so that they may promptly 'squash it' before it takes root? What better way to exercise absolute power than for men to institute <u>a supposedly 'Jesus-sanctioned' mandatory interrogation</u>? Hence, for almost 2 millennia the Catholic hierarchy has 'made up its own rules' and then '<u>claimed</u> that they were Jesus' rules', all to ensure their absolute - if not physical, then spiritual and emotional - control over the nations. And the Sacrament of Confession - the Catholic hierarchy's <u>mandatory interrogations</u> in the name of Christ - no doubt helped secure this absolute power for the Catholic Church in the Middle Ages.

Thus, in the interest of their own glory, Catholicism has created a second false method of forgiveness in the **Sacrament of Confession**. This false method states that **A**) 'we are forgiven every time we <u>ask</u> forgiveness in the confessional', and B) 'it is righteous for the Catholic hierarchy to refuse to forgive people'. But both of these assertions by Catholicism directly oppose and contradict Jesus' teaching which states that A) 'we are forgiven only when we forgive others', and B) 'by refusing to forgive others, we actually bind or retain the sins of others'. And so the Catholic hierarchy has it totally backwards, saying 'Tell us the truth, and we will set you free'. But since people tell them 'the truth according to Catholicism's warped version of good and evil', thereby never realizing their true sin of idolatry, people are in fact 'enslaved with what they were told would set them free'. Again 'what sets us free' is being told the truth about true forgiveness and judgment. We are set free by 'forgiving others', not 'asking forgiveness'; or as Catholicism would assert is 'telling them the truth in their mandatory interrogations'. We are set free by being told that 'we do not need our religious leaders for salvation', and that 'they are <u>not helping</u> us to enter into the kingdom of heaven, but rather hindering, by taking away, hiding, and obscuring the key of knowledge, all for the propagation of their own hidden caste system'. And in particular, it is the Catholic leaders who are masters at obscuring true knowledge with their man-made ignorance, saying 'We adhere to Jesus' simple teachings', while simultaneously creating mountains of convoluted doctrine (i.e., their second false method of forgiveness in the Sacrament of Confession) in order to skillfully negate and oppose His teachings; which is of course done in the interest of maintaining their hidden caste system of unrighteous authority and supremacy.

If the Catholic hierarchy had truly received 'keys' or the 'Holy Spirit' from Jesus - that is, if they actually 'owned' the true knowledge of Christ - they would understand that the imparting of 'keys' and/or the 'Holy Spirit' is <u>NOT</u> an imparting of <u>authority</u> and <u>power</u>, but rather an imparting of <u>humility</u>; understanding that 'since we are all <u>one body</u> of people', to 'not forgive someone else' is to 'not forgive

ourselves', and to 'bind someone else's sins', is to 'bind them to ourselves'. Truly receiving 'the keys to the kingdom of heaven' and/or 'the Holy Spirit' means you are given 'full sight' to understand that 'since we are all one body of people', judging others places the same measure of judgment 'back on yourself'. The Catholic hierarchy may say that 'they have sight and truly understand this concept', but if they truly had sight and understood, then they would not condemn the world to eternal damnation for not 'worshiping the works (i.e., the Eucharist) which their own fingers have made' (Isaiah 2.8); which only proves their **blindness**, and that 'they have an **enormous plank** in their eye, while thinking it is a miniscule speck'. And so the Catholic hierarchy does not understand that by 'condemning the world to no salvation outside their man-made institution', they have condemned themselves to no salvation; that is, they will have measured out to them what they measured out to others. The Catholic hierarchy does not understand that, as many times as they may **claim** that 'they forgive others', by condemning others outside of Catholicism to eternal damnation, they in fact clearly do not forgive others; of course confusing themselves by **believing** that 'it is God who does not forgive people outside of Catholicism', when it is really 'them and their forefathers' who do not forgive. Speaking from behind a false image and consequential false identity of Christ, the Catholic hierarchy has 'measured out no salvation for everyone who does not follow their idolatry and bow to their man-made forgiveness and laws', thereby blindly causing countless murders, oppression, and untold desolation, while hypocritically condemning 'those who actually commit the murders, oppression, and untold desolation'. Thus 'Jesus' law of judgment' dictates that they will 'receive back what they have measured out', and be 'condemned for that which they condemned others for'; retaining and binding the sins of others. That is, the Catholic hierarchy will receive 'no salvation', and they will be condemned as murderers, terrorists, liars, perverts, traders, thieves, adulterers, etc. for, not only condemning others of these things, but actually being the cause of these things. And ultimately, for making a false image of Christ and speaking lies in His name, thereby creating false personas of Jesus and God, the Catholic hierarchy (as well as all religious leaders speaking lies in the names of Jesus and God) will have the same 'done unto them', with Satan being allowed to 'speak lies in their name from behind false images - i.e., murderers, terrorists, liars, perverts, etc. - of them'; hence being tormented and tortured with 'false personas of themselves' for tormenting and torturing Christ with a false persona of Himself.

11. False Prejudgments based on the Concept of Mortal Sins

The Catholic Church divides sins into 2 categories: mortal and venial. A mortal sin is one in which a person's soul is 'mortally wounded', and, if the sin is not confessed to a Catholic priest in the Sacrament of Confession **before death**, then the person will be **condemned to eternal damnation**. A person who has committed a mortal sin is said by the Catholic Church to be 'under pain of mortal sin'; which many times is simply 'pain of <u>Catholic guilt</u> that has been inflicted on innocent people'. <u>Mortal sins</u> are 'supposed to' represent sins that are *more serious* in nature, whereas venial sins are *less serious* sins. While venial sins are less serious, according to Catholic doctrine, they will still, if un-confessed, send people to 'purgatory' where they will be 'purged of their sins' before being allowed to enter heaven; noting that there may be a 'purging time' according to 'the measure one has used for others', but the concept of 'purgatory' existing aside from and independent of 'hell' is a creation of Catholic doctrine. It has already been stated multiple times that, because Satan has tricked Catholicism (and all other religions) into 'redefining good and evil', their definition of a 'real sin' and a 'non-sin' is skewed and totally backwards in many instances. Consequently, they consider things such as 'sex outside of their approved definition of proper sex' and 'not attending Mass on Sunday' as mortal 'real sins', when they are actually 'non-sins'. And they consider 'speaking God's name in vain' and 'leading the multitudes astray to worship a false idol' as 'non-sins', when they are actually 'real sins'. So, aside from Catholicism's 'definition of real sins and non-sins' being skewed, the purpose of this Section is to address that, even if there is agreement that 'a sin - such as murder, rape, violence, etc. - is serious in nature', by calling a sin 'mortal', we have placed blind judgment on the person who committed the crime. In other words, if we make a list of sins divided into 'serious and non-serious', then say 'Everyone who commits a serious sin and does not confess it to a priest will go to hell', we have just placed a blind judgment on that person, thereby totally negating and ignoring 'God's law of judgment'. From Matthew 7.1-2, 'God's law of judgment' states that 'If you judge others, you will be judged, and if you don't judge others, you will not be judged; for the measure you use to judge others, is the measure you are judged with'. So aside from Catholicism's method of forgiveness in the Sacrament of Confession being a false method of forgiveness with consequential false judgment that is <u>not</u> 'the judgment of God', by creating 'a black and white list of mortal sins', Catholicism sets up 'prejudgment' that is false, as two different people, both committing the same crime, may receive 'one quilty' and 'one not quilty' judgment from God, depending solely on 'whether or not they judge others', and 'the measure they use to judge others'.

As an example, consider 'adultery'; noting that 'adultery' here is referring to 'a broken agreement between a man and a woman', and can just as well apply to 'any broken agreement between two parties or entities'. If someone commits adultery, and does not condemn others for their sins, then they will not be condemned for adultery. If a different person commits adultery, and does condemn others for their sins, then they will be condemned for adultery (in addition to retaining the sins that they condemned others for). So while one person will be condemned for adultery, the other is innocent of adultery based solely on how each person judged others. Note that, this in no way excuses the blatant, continual hurting and manipulating of people and their feelings, only to say 'I don't condemn others of adultery, so I can freely commit adultery'. If so, then you are testing God, and He will of course allow you to be tested in return to see how you like 'blatant, continual hurting and manipulating of your feelings'. I.e.,

you will be <u>purified</u> by having 'done unto you' as you have done to others. Also, it must be clarified that, you may not have even committed adultery, yet you will be found <u>guilty</u> of adultery if you <u>condemn</u> <u>others for adultery</u>. This is 'God's law of judgment' which promotes 'empathy, understanding, and equality', while discouraging 'judgment, misunderstanding, and supremacy'. But the Catholic Church's false method of forgiveness <u>negates</u> this 'empathy, understanding, and equality' by telling 'guilty people who <u>don't</u> forgive others' that 'they are forgiven and will <u>not</u> be judged'; which sets up <u>even more false judgments</u> by making the <u>guilty think</u> that they are innocent, ultimately causing them to act with 'judgment, misunderstanding, and supremacy' toward others. Thus, <u>aside from</u> 'the <u>guilty thinking</u> that they will be judged as <u>innocent</u>' through Catholic false forgiveness, Catholicism, by setting up <u>the concept of mortal sins</u> with <u>prejudgments</u> of eternal damnation, makes 'some who are <u>innocent</u>' think that they are <u>guilty</u>. I.e., the Catholic Church's concept of mortal sins and prejudgments of eternal damnation negates and ignores 'God's law judgment', thereby placing false 'blanket' judgments on the multitudes, which leads <u>both</u> 'guilty and innocent' to be considered as <u>guilty</u>. Think about it. The very fact that Catholicism has named a sin 'a mortal sin' is 'a <u>guilty judgment'</u> in itself that may be condemning someone falsely.

The Catholic Church despises the true meaning of 'God's law of judgment' because they cannot actively and physically monitor 'who is quilty or innocent' - i.e., who is 'going to hell' or 'not going to hell' - of course meaning that they have no spiritual authority over God's people. The 'man on the left' may be found innocent, and the 'man on the right' may be found guilty, but they both committed the same sin. The Catholic hierarchy will say 'How are we going to know who to label as guilty and who to label as innocent'? The answer is 'you can't know'; it's incalculable, and only God knows. And so God's system of judgment places varying penalties on people based on 'all the varying degrees of measure that people have used to judge others'. This system of judgment, like God Himself, is incalculable, and any human outside of another human cannot compute or judge 'who is forgiven or not forgiven' and 'what degree of penalty they are assigned for not forgiving'. And that is why Satan hates 'God's system of forgiveness and judgment': it takes all control away from man-made principalities. Satan uses manmade principalities - such as the Catholic Church - as his puppets, telling them to claim that 'they can calculate what is incalculable', in order to create confusion and division among the multitudes. And so, if there is no longer a need for man-made principalities because of 'God's law of forgiveness and judgment', then Satan also loses all control and power, and consequently the ability to cause confusion and division among the multitudes. Thus, because 'God's system of forgiveness and judgment' is a system that operates without the interference of man-made principalities, ultimately stripping them of their authority and control over God's people, the Catholic hierarchy (unknowingly led by Satan) has, and will continue to, do everything they can to obscure this autonomous system, attaching themselves to it through double tongue language in order to keep themselves 'necessary in the chain of salvation' as if they dictate 'how and to what degree' God judges His people; of course noting that Catholicism (as well as many other religions) has falsely dictated God's judgment for almost 2 millennia, declaring 'eternal damnation to all who do not bow to their false god', thereby essentially stating that 'it is a mortal sin to **not** be Catholic'.

The Catholic hierarchy (as well as most other religious hierarchies) does not understand that penalties for sinning are more or less on a sliding scale. The less you judge others, the less you are judged. The more you judge others, the more you are judged. So we must realize that judgment is based on 'how you perceive others', not 'how the Catholic Church perceives you'. I.e., judgment is not based on Catholicism's false prejudgments, as established by their doctrine of mortal sins. You may not have done anything wrong at all, but since you judge others harshly, you will be judged harshly. It helps to think of 'judging others' as being the same as 'bearing false witness against others'. You might say 'That person is going to hell because they are an adulterer, a thief, remarried, or whatever', but you don't actually know if God finds them guilty or not. Based on 'whether or not they have judged others', they may be innocent before God, yet YOU SaY they are guilty. Hence, it is now you who is guilty of 'bearing false witness against your neighbor'. Therefore, if God applies the same rules to you that you apply to others, He will allow Satan to bear false witness against you so that you are condemned for things you did not even do. In other words, if you falsely condemn an innocent man, you will be treated as 'an innocent man who is falsely condemned'. For not giving a fair trial to someone else, you will **not be given** a fair trial. 'For <u>not **showing** mercy</u> when you judge, you will <u>not</u> be **shown** mercy when you are judged' (James 2.13). Also, to compound this problem, many people's 'perception of true right and true wrong' has been poisoned by our religious leaders, so 'what they think is fair' is actually unfair. If you think this is impossible, consider that the religious leaders 2000 years ago - having 'a warped sense of right and wrong' - persuaded the people to condemn Jesus, an innocent Man; obviously giving Him an unfair and unjust trial. Since the religious leaders of Jesus' day had identified themselves as being 'one with God' (when in reality being 'one with Satan'), they were able to make it seem right to the people to pass judgment on Jesus for 'opposing the religious leaders'; of course being 'wrongly' taught from the earliest ages of life that 'to oppose the religious leaders of Judaism' was 'to <u>also</u> oppose God'. And so the religious leaders and all their followers, by passing judgment on Jesus as being guilty (when we all know that God considered Him innocent), were themselves guilty of 'bearing false witness' and 'giving an unfair and unjust trial', while many of them (especially the leaders) most likely thought that 'they were being witnesses for God' and 'giving a fair and righteous trial' to a Man who they were convinced was absolutely guilty before God. So the big question you must ask yourself is 'Am I judging others, just as they did 2000 years ago, based on accepted Catholic, Christian, Muslim, Jewish, or Hindu **teaching**, or am I judging others based on what is truly in my heart?' ... remembering of course that the **New Covenant** states 'God's laws are written on our heart and no one shall teach those laws to his neighbor'. By judging others based on 'accepted teaching of their religion' the Jewish people's 'perception of right and wrong' became poisoned, and they ended up judging unfairly - while truly believing that they were judging fairly - thereby being blindly 'led into a ditch' by their religious leaders. As Jesus says, "If the blind leads the blind, both will fall into a ditch" (Matthew 15.14). So we should be careful not to be 'the parrot' of a blind teacher; he will only lead people into a ditch - i.e., hell - by making them judge others unrighteously, just as they judged Jesus unrighteously 2000 years ago. Thus, we must realize that most of humanity's perception of judgment (i.e., true right and true wrong) has been skewed by the influence of our religious leaders (i.e., our blind, false teachers), and to a large extent by 'Catholicism and their false persona of Christ' which has produced

their <u>man-made</u>, <u>limited</u>, and <u>fallible</u> concept of <u>mortal sins</u>, and consequential <u>false prejudgments</u>. And these false prejudgments, coupled with 'the redefinition of real sins and non-sins', has no doubt led the majority of humanity, to some degree, to <u>judge unfairly</u>, while <u>thinking</u> that they <u>judge fairly</u>.

John 1.17 says "For the <u>law</u> was given through <u>Moses</u>, but <u>grace</u> and <u>truth</u> came through <u>Jesus Christ</u>". 'Moses' written law of sin and judgment' was a starting point to establish some sort of government, but like '<u>Catholicism's written law</u> of mortal sins and prejudgments', Moses' written law was <u>fallible</u>; realizing that Moses' written law pertained largely to penalties limited to our lifespan on earth, whereas Catholicism's written law pertains to penalties that effect our eternal life, making the implications of Catholic law much more serious. And so Moses' written law (just like Catholic law) set up some 'black and white boundaries', so to speak, while 'Jesus' law of forgiveness and judgment' brought grace, truth, and understanding that there are 'many shades of gray' to sinning and judgment; making it clear that 'God's system of forgiveness and judgment' is incalculable to 'men outside of other men', and consequently Why Jesus sealed the New Covenant, bypassing all man-made principalities to establish a direct relationship between God and man. Therefore, we must understand that Catholicism, by setting up their own 'black and white boundaries' with a 'written law of mortal sins and (false) prejudgments', basically <u>negated</u> Jesus' 'sealing of the New Covenant' and 'establishing of an autonomous system of forgiveness and judgment', thereby continuing in the ignorance of the past law, and even 'adding to' and 'compounding' the ignorance by instituting laws and judgments that were not from God or Jesus, but Satan; of course making it clear that they never received 'the keys to heaven or the Holy Spirit'. As already stated in Section 10, receiving either 'the keys to the kingdom of heaven' or 'the Holy Spirit' means to understand and be ruled by 'Jesus' law of forgiveness and judgment'; which of course is based on the idea that 'we are all one body of people, forgiving others and not judging others to not come under judgment, and not forgiving and judging others to come under judgment'. In other words, those who have 'received the Holy Spirit' are not ruled by 'man-made black and white boundaries and laws', but rather by a 'boundless Spirit' that teaches us to 'treat others as ourselves' because in reality 'they are you, and you are them, all being part of the same body of people'. As Paul says in Romans 7.6, "Now however we are <u>free from the law</u>, having died to that which once held us <u>prisoner</u>. <u>No longer do we</u> serve in the old way of a written law, but in the new way of the Spirit." To 'serve in the new way of the <u>Spirit</u>' - or as Jesus says in John 4.23, 'true worshipers will worship the Father in <u>spirit</u> and <u>truth</u>' - is to (realizing that 'to love others is to love God') simply 'love others as ourselves'; which, as being 'one body of people', ultimately means 'judging others to condemn ourselves as being quilty', and 'not judging others to declare ourselves as <u>innocent</u>'. Thus, since 'Catholicism's written law of mortal sins and (<u>false</u>) prejudgments' does not account for this means of true judgment, we can be certain that it did not originate from 'the grace and truth of Jesus Christ'; of course meaning that, having obviously not received the Holy Spirit, they do not 'serve in the new way of the Holy Spirit', but rather are still held prisoner by the Spirit of Error and his **fallible laws** of **false** forgiveness and **false** judgment.

'God's (i.e. Jesus') law of forgiveness and judgment' is <u>unchanging</u>, just as 'His word' is unchanging, in 'every age of man'. If this is so, then what is the purpose of the Catholic hierarchy convening meetings and councils, and constantly changing their stance or judgment on various issues? That is, if we know 'God's law of forgiveness and judgment' says that 'Those who don't judge others, will not be judged',

then the Catholic hierarchy's ever-changing viewpoint on various issues is irrelevant to 'how people are judged'. Even if the Catholic hierarchy digs up a Scripture passage and reinterprets it, thereby changing their stance on issues such as homosexuality, adultery, remarriage, etc., it does not matter, as 'Jesus' law of forgiveness and judgment' Supersedes any of their external judgments. In other words, even if Paul or Moses makes mention of these matters in a sinful context, Jesus tells us that 'they will **not** come under judgment if they don't judge others'; of course meaning that 'Catholicism's written law of mortal sins and prejudaments' is unrighteous because it does not account for 'people's individual judgment of others' and how that affects 'the judgment placed on them'. So ultimately, the Catholic hierarchy (including most other religious hierarchies), by 'passing judgment on these matters', does not even realize that 'it is them who will come under judgment for judging others'; being condemned for that which they condemned others for. Thus the Catholic hierarchy's ever-changing doctrine - that they <u>disguise</u> with the twisted metaphor of 'a child (i.e., the Catholic Church itself) in infancy maturing into an adult' - is a reflection of Satan's ever-changing and evolving doctrine that he uses to stay normalized in 'every age of man'; noting that the reason Catholicism changes their stance on issues, especially in today's world of cameras and the internet, is to 'stay popular' and 'in favor' so that they can more easily retain their authority (think about Vatican II). But the Catholic hierarchy's ever-changing doctrine is the antithesis of 'a God who never changes' and is 'the same God yesterday, today, and forever'. God's righteous laws of judgment never change, and, by continually changing their doctrine (especially in recent times), the Catholic Church proves that their 'written law of mortal sins and *prejudgments'* is from the mind of Satan, who is continually changing in order to cause <u>unrighteous</u> judgment that leads to confusion and dissention; and ultimately to 'division, war, and hate'. Do not believe the Catholic hierarchy when they say 'We judge no one'; they speak a double tongue lie. Their man-made 'law of mortal sins and prejudgments' places judgment on everyone, and they are the deliverers of that man-made law. Therefore, they most definitely 'judge everyone' while saying with a double tongue that 'We judge no one', proving that the Catholic law originates from the double mind of Satan, and **not** from 'the grace and truth of Jesus Christ'.

12. The Anti-Good News: False Justification by Deeds of the Catholic Law

'The Good News'; these are words that have been spoken countless times in our lifetime, yet because of the lies inherited from Catholicism, we have no idea 'what the Good News actually is'. Many people will say the Good News is that 'Jesus died for our sins so that we can be forgiven and have eternal life'. But as already shown in Section 9, A) God already forgave people, and B) people could already enter heaven (i.e., eternal life) before the birth of Christ; noting that the latter is proven first, by Elijah being taken up to heaven in 2 Kings 2.11, and second, by Lazarus being carried by angels to 'a place' (i.e., heaven) that obviously represents the opposite of Hades (i.e., hell) in Luke 16.22-23. So again, as mentioned in Section 9, Jesus' sole purpose was not to 'allow for God to forgive our sins' (which He could already forgive) or 'open the gates of heaven' (which were already open), but rather 'to remove what causes us to sin (i.e., idolatry or supremacy) so that there is a diminishing or remission of sinfulness'. And since 'the Jewish religion and all other religions worshiping other gods' represented idolatry - i.e. the supremacy of man using God's (or 'a god's') name that leads to our consequential enslavement - Jesus' sole purpose was to <u>destroy religion</u>, thereby destroying *supremacy* and *enslavement* in order to bring about equality, freedom, and consequently WOrld peace. Remember, the New Covenant that was sealed by Jesus' death on the cross states that 'we all know God equally (i.e. the equality clause) and have a direct <u>relationship</u> with God, therefore we are enslaved to no one in His name'. Thus, the **true** Good News of the New Covenant, which has been obscured and rejected by humanity (being led of course by Catholicism), actually details an end to the idolatrous practices of our religious leaders, because it is the supremacy of our religious leaders that creates 'enslavement, oppression, and dissension' that leads to 'division, war, and hate'; i.e., it is the supremacy of the religious leaders that is the cause of sinning. And so the true Good News of the New Covenant, which will only be realized upon the return of Christ (see Matthew 24.14), is that 'Jesus will ultimately and eventually remove and destroy the supremacy of our <u>religions</u> that is the <u>cause of sinning</u> - i.e., the <u>cause</u> of 'division, war, and hate' - so that <u>humanity</u>, through Jesus Christ, will be united as one, with one God' (Galatians 3.28 and Zechariah 14.9).

To fully grasp this true nature of the Good News (i.e., that 'the Good News = the end of religion'), we must first identify the 'Bad News' that the 'Good News' was 'in response to'. That is, if there was a need to announce a 'Good News', there must have been a previous 'Bad News' that catalyzed this need for Good News. So what was the 'Bad News'? First, let's recall that our term for 'religion' has been redefined. 2000 years ago 'religion' = 'kindness and mercy' (see James 1.27), and today 'religion' = 'sacrifices, ceremonies, rituals, circumcisions, and sacraments'. So when Jesus or the Prophets refer (see Isaiah 1.11-17, Micah 6.6-8, and Jeremiah 7.22-23) to any of these sacrifices and ceremonies (i.e., 'deeds or works of the Jewish law'), they are talking about our modern day religious practices. That means, by Jesus saying 'God wants kindness and mercy, and not sacrifice' (Matthew 9.13), He is actually saying 'God does not want your religious practices'; realizing of course that we have made the names of Jesus and the Prophets synonymous with religion, when they were in fact anti-religion. Think about it. This one verse (Matthew 9.13) is essentially telling us that 'religion (i.e., sacrifices and ceremonies)

produces hate and oppression'; noting that 'hate and oppression' is the opposite of 'kindness and mercy'. Thus, the man-made 'Bad News' was, and still is, that 'religion creates a caste system of supremacy that breeds - both inside the religion and among other religions - hate and oppression which leads to enslavement and dissension, ultimately causing division, war, and hate'. And so having identified the Bad News, we can now understand that 'the true Good News which was in response to the Bad News' was, and still is, simply 'the end of religion'; i.e., sacrifices and ceremonies. The true Good News is that 'religion is a system created by men in the name of the one true God'. The true Good News is that 'there is no such thing as religion'. The true Good News is that 'the true worship of God is simply loving others as ourselves' - as 'loving others' = 'loving God' (see Matthew 25.40&45) just as 'hating others' = 'hating God' - and that 'religion and all of its Sacrifices and Ceremonies do not supersede or go beyond this true worship, but rather defile this true worship by leading us to blindly hate others, thereby also blindly hating God'. Therefore, the true Good News is that 'we only need to love others as ourselves to receive salvation'.

Thus, if the 'Bad News' = 'religion', and the 'Good News' = 'no religion', then how is it that the religion of Catholicism - all of their sacrifices (i.e. the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass), ceremonies, rituals, and sacraments - represents the Good News? Consider that an antichrist was (and is) a false apostle who looked and sounded like the true Apostles, but actually taught things that were opposite of Christ's teachings, all while saying that they taught Christ's teachings. Subsequently, for nearly 2000 years, antichrists following in the footsteps of the 'original antichrists' have asserted that 'they preach the message of Christ', while actually preaching the opposite of Christ's message. Therefore, we must recognize that, if Catholicism asserts that they preach 'Christ's message of equality and freedom', while actually preaching and practicing 'their own opposite message of supremacy and enslavement', then we can conclude that the supposed Good News which the Catholic antichrists teach is actually the Anti-Good News. I.e., the Catholic Good News = Anti-Good News: doctrine that uses the name and words of Christ and His Apostles, thereby sounding like Good News, yet defiling and contradicting everything that they stood for, hence ultimately being a rehashed version of Bad News that the New Covenant was designed to eliminate. Thus, Catholicism's Anti-Good News is 'a <u>hidden</u> message of supremacy, exclusion, and enslavement' that is disguised as 'Christ's message of equality, inclusion, and freedom'. And it is this 'hidden message' that has secretly catalyzed much of the 'division, war, and hate' witnessed in the last two millennia.

We must come to the understanding that, since the entire Christian world has its roots in Catholicism, then the entire Christian world has inherited a distorted view of the true Good News; the entire Christian world has, to some degree, inherited the Anti-Good News. This fact is evident just by the way we interact with each other in public. Remembering that the 'Bad News' = 'religion', and the 'Good News' = 'no religion', then consider that most people would agree that 'if you are going to go out and have a good time, it's best to not talk about religion, and every time we do talk about religion in public, it brings up such staunch division that everyone ends up having a bad time'. Therefore, we must come to the realization that our instinct tells us 'religion' = 'a bad time' (i.e., Bad News), and 'no religion'

= 'a good time' (i.e., Good News). But, according to Catholic doctrine, 'religion' is supposed to equal 'a good time'. So why is there such a contradiction between 'what they tell us is the truth' and 'the way we feel'? Think about it. If religion was such Good News, then would we not all be excited to talk about it in public? Obviously our instincts - that is, our hearts, where God placed His laws - do not agree with 'the version of Good News' that we have all inherited from Catholicism, proving that the Catholic Anti-Good News is **not** the same true Good News which God placed in our hearts, as written in the New Covenant. Obviously, when we talk about Catholicism's Anti-Good News (or any Protestant offshoot) in public, it speaks loud and clear to people's hearts, telling them that it is 'a message of supremacy and exclusion'. Yet, because the Catholic Anti-Good News (or again, any Protestant offshoot) is disguised with 'the name of Jesus and the words of love', people's minds are confused, and sensing inner conflict from double minded language, people lash out in disagreement, which leads to division and dissension. The very fact that Catholic priests will no longer come out and openly say 'There is no salvation outside Catholicism' and 'There is no forgiveness outside of Catholicism', points to their own inner conflict, and that their hearts are in disagreement with their minds. You must think that, if Catholic priests truly believed that 'their Catholic version of the Good News' was the true Good News, then they would be 'shouting it from the rooftops'. Thus, because obviously our hearts are smarter than our minds, we should learn to listen to our hearts, thereby coming to the self evident conclusion that Catholicism's supposed Good News is actually Bad News which causes 'division, war, and hate'; understanding that, if Catholicism's supposed Good News were truly Good News, then it could be told to anyone on the planet and they would be **excited** to hear about it. That is, the <u>true</u> Good News is **Universal**, applying to every human being equally, with no papers to sign or meetings (ceremonies) to attend, and excluding no one, thereby allowing anyone who simply 'loves others as themselves' to receive eternal life.

Again, the true Good News is that 'the <u>true worship</u> of God is simply loving others as ourselves' - as 'loving others' = 'loving God' (see Matthew 25.40&45) just as 'hating others' = 'hating God' - and that 'religion and all of its Sacrifices and ceremonies <u>do not supersede</u> or go beyond this true worship, but rather <u>defile</u> this true worship by leading us to blindly hate <u>others</u>, thereby <u>also blindly hating God'</u> (see also James 3.9). Therefore, the true Good News is that 'we <u>Only</u> need to love others as ourselves to <u>receive salvation</u>'. In other words, we do not receive <u>salvation</u>, or we are <u>not justified</u> before God, by performing any type of 'sacrifice, ceremony, ritual, circumcision, or sacrament' - which are referred to as 'works or <u>deeds</u> of the Jewish law, Catholic law, Muslim law, etc.' - but rather by simply 'loving our neighbor as ourselves', performing 'works or <u>deeds</u> of kindness and mercy'; noting that, performing 'religious works or deeds' actually makes us hate and judge our neighbor who does not perform the <u>same</u> 'religious works or deeds' as us. Paul, in particular, tried to convey this very same idea - that 'God is <u>not worshiped</u> by men's hands performing religious deeds' (Acts 17.25) - in his writings. Examine the following quotes.

1. <u>Galatians 5.2-6 and 5.14</u> says, "Indeed I, Paul, say to you that if you become <u>circumcised</u>, Christ will profit you <u>nothing</u>. And I testify again to every man who becomes <u>circumcised</u> (a 'deed' of the Jewish law) that he is a debtor to keep the whole law. You have become estranged

from Christ, you who attempt to be justified by law; you have fallen from grace. For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision avails anything, but faith working through love. For all the law is fulfilled in one word: 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself'"... through 'works and deeds of kindness and mercy'. Note that Paul reiterates this in 1 Corinthians 7.19: "Circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but keeping the Commandments of God is what matters".

- 2. In <u>Galatians 2.16</u>, immediately after chastising Peter for making a distinction between the Jewish circumcised and the Gentile uncircumcised, essentially practicing <u>religious bigotry and supremacy</u> (or as Paul says 'boasting') toward those who did not perform the 'works or deeds of the Jewish law', Paul says, "Man is <u>not justified by the works of the law</u> but by faith in Jesus Christ, for by the <u>works of the law</u> no flesh shall be justified." Paul even continues in <u>Galatians</u> 3.2, essentially saying that 'You <u>do not receive the Spirit by the works of the law</u>, but by hearing and believing the word of Christ'. And the word of Christ is to simply 'love one another through works and deeds of kindness and mercy'.
- 3. In <u>Romans 3.20&28</u> Paul says "By the <u>deeds of the law</u> no flesh will be justified in God's sight. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith apart from the <u>deeds of the law</u>." It is important to note the context here, as Romans 2.25-29 says 'Since both Jew and Gentile are <u>equal</u>, <u>circumcision</u> does <u>not matter</u>; rather it is a man's <u>righteousness</u> that matters'. This is reiterated in Romans 4.11 by Paul saying that 'Abraham was <u>righteous</u> while <u>still uncircumcised</u>; therefore the circumcision <u>did not justify</u> Abraham before God, but rather his righteousness'.

First of all, there is great error on the part of the entire Christian world with regard to the terminology 'deeds or works'. The confusion stems from the fact that the same word 'WOrks' (or 'deeds') was used to describe both something **negative**, or 'works of the Jewish law' such as 'sacrifices, purification ceremonies, rituals, and circumcisions', and simultaneously something positive, or 'works of kindness and mercy' (i.e., good works); noting that 'works of any religious law' = 'honoring God with meaningless words' (Mark 7.6), which stresses in itself the importance of honoring God with 'works of kindness and mercy'. Yet, especially Protestantism, believes that these '2 different works' are one in the same, therefore <u>erroneously</u> believing that, to varying degrees, 'works of kindness and mercy' are <u>not</u> **necessary** for salvation, with salvation being **solely** dependent on them saying 'I believe in Jesus' 3 times, as if some kind of spiritual spell. Note that this Protestant belief in 'merely saying I believe in Jesus to be saved' is a 'work of the Protestant law', and as Romans 3.20 infers, 'By merely saying I believe in Jesus, no flesh will be justified in God's sight'; of course implying that 'a deed of the Protestant law' = 'merely saying I believe in Jesus'. Catholicism does believe that 'good works' are necessary for salvation, but is <u>blind</u> to the fact that their 'works of the <u>Catholic</u> law' (i.e., their <u>sacraments</u> such as the Holy <u>Sacrifice</u> of the Mass and <u>Confession</u>) are the <u>same</u> unnecessary and unrighteous 'works of the <u>Jewish</u> law' that Paul spoke about 2000 years ago. And so, since <u>Catholics</u> think they will be justified by 'performing works of the Catholic law', believing in error that 'works of the law' Could not possibly be referring to their sacraments, when they are indeed the <u>same rehashed</u> 'works of the law' in disguise, and since **Protestants** think they will be <u>justified</u> by 'not performing any works (i.e., religious

works <u>or good works</u>)' - although they still <u>unknowingly</u> perform the same <u>useless</u> religious 'weekly' works (i.e., their weekly worship services and ceremonies) as Catholicism in different form - <u>both</u>
Catholicism and Protestantism could not be <u>farther</u> from the truth. To show that the word 'works' (or 'deeds') <u>must have had 2 very different meanings</u>, examine the following, which are blatant, nonsense contradictions <u>if</u> the word 'works' (or 'deeds') is taken to have <u>one singular meaning</u>.

- 1. Right <u>before</u> Paul says 'No one is justified (or saved) in the sight of God by <u>deeds</u> or <u>works of the law'</u> (Romans 3.20&28), he says 'On <u>judgment day</u> God will render to each one <u>according to his deeds</u>: <u>eternal life</u> for those who do <u>good</u>, and <u>tribulation</u> for those who do <u>evil'</u> (Romans <u>2.5-9</u>, and see also Matthew 16.27). Paul even continues in verse 10 saying "Glory, honor, and peace to <u>everyone</u> who <u>Works what is good</u>". Therefore, with these verses being in the <u>same context</u> as one another, it is obvious that Paul used 'works or deeds' to describe <u>2 very different</u> and <u>opposite</u> actions: the 1st, a 'work or deed of kindness' that brings <u>eternal life</u>, and the 2nd, a 'work or deed of the law' which makes people 'boast' in supremacy (see Romans 2.17 & 3.27 and Ephesians 2.9) thereby causing 'division, war, and hate', and leading people to <u>eternal tribulation</u>. And so if these 2 passages Romans 3.20&28 and Romans 2.5-9 are interpreted with 'works' or 'deeds' having <u>one blanket meaning</u> of 'any human action', nothing makes sense; i.e., you must know the <u>context</u> in order to determine which 'works' or 'deeds' they are referring to.
- 2. Paul says in <u>Ephesians 2.9</u> that 'We are saved <u>not of works</u> (of the law), lest anyone should <u>boast</u>'. Then the very next verse (10) says that 'We were <u>created for good works'</u>; making it Obvious that Paul was using the <u>same word</u> to mean '2 very different works' of which one was <u>negative</u> (verse 9) and the other <u>positive</u> (verse 10). Noting also that these verses are written in the <u>context</u> of Paul speaking yet again about the <u>equality</u> of the Jews (the <u>circumcised</u>) to the Gentiles (the <u>uncircumcised</u>), and that circumcision and other 'ordinances of the law' (which implies accompanying 'works of the law') were <u>abolished</u> by Christ in order to break down 'the middle wall of separation' between the Jews and Gentiles that kept them from attaining <u>peace</u>.
- 3. Hebrews 9.9&10 (which Paul may or may not have written) says 'Offerings and animal sacrifices (i.e., works of the law) presented to God cannot make the worshiper perfect in regard to conscience, since they have to do only with food, drink, various purification ceremonies, and other ordinances of the law'; ultimately meaning that these 'sacrifices and ceremonies' are, in reality, just 'dead works'. Then Hebrews 13.16 says that 'The only sacrifices (i.e., works) that God is pleased with are those of doing good and sharing'; noting that Jesus was the last and final acceptable Sacrifice to God (Hebrews 10.12). Hebrews 13.21 also says 'We are made complete through good works'. And so Hebrews is yet again using the same word, 'works', to mean both a negative dead work (i.e., sacrifices, ceremonies, and other 'works of the law'), and a positive good work (i.e., 'doing good and sharing'). Notice that Hebrews even uses the same word, 'sacrifice', to also mean both a negative dead work, and a positive good work (as in Hebrews 13.16). Therefore, to take the word 'works' (or 'deeds') out of context, and then give it

<u>one singular meaning</u>, will yield interpretations that are totally <u>backwards</u> and <u>opposite</u> of the <u>original</u> intended meaning, resulting in blatant, nonsense <u>contradictions</u> within the <u>same</u> <u>context</u>.

Thus, when James 2.24 says "A man is justified by works, and not by faith only", he compliments and does **not** contradict Paul, as 'the **context** in which James is speaking' is 'the context of helping others by doing <u>good deeds</u> such as <u>feeding the hungry</u> and <u>clothing the naked</u>'; i.e., 'the <u>context</u> of works of kindness and mercy'. Additionally, it should be noted that Jesus Himself says in Matthew 25.31-46 (just as Paul also says in Romans 2.5-9), 'When I (Jesus) return, I will gather those who have **done** works of kindness and mercy - i.e., feeding the hungry and clothing the naked - to eternal life, and those who have not done works of kindness and mercy to eternal punishment'. Jesus also says in the last page of the Bible that 'I am returning to <u>reward</u> everyone according to his work' (Revelation 22.12); which is again reiterated in Matthew 16.27. Therefore, we must know the difference between 'negative works of any religious law' and 'positive works of kindness and mercy'. We must know that Jesus was in essence saying in Matthew 9.13, 'God wants works of kindness and mercy, and not works of any religious law'; which includes all of the daily and weekly 'prayers, rituals, ceremonies, and sacraments' of Catholicism, Judaism, Islam, Protestantism, Hinduism, Buddhism, etc. We must know that Jesus was in essence saying to the Samaritan woman at the well, 'The hour is coming when you will no longer perform deeds of the law on Mount Gerizim nor in Jerusalem, but you will only perform deeds of kindness and mercy, for this, simply loving others as yourself, is the true worship of God' (John 4.21-24).

And so Paul, in Galatians 5.2-6 and 5.14, Galatians 2.16 and 3.2, and Romans 3.20&28, was trying to convey that, through their 'works of the law', the Jews thought that they would be saved (or justified), but it was rather the opposite, as 'believing in sacrifices, ceremonies, rituals, repetitive prayers, and circumcisions to be saved' caused them to 'boast in supremacy' (Romans 2.17 & 3.27, and Ephesians 2.9), ultimately persecuting and hating the Gentiles (i.e., the uncircumcised), thereby hating God (see James 3.9) and essentially sentencing themselves to eternal damnation. And so the true Good News details an end to 'works or deeds of any religious law' because they only create supremacy that ultimately leads to 'division, war, and hate'; with 'hate' including 'unknowingly hating God because you hate others who are made in His similitude'. The true Good News details an end to 'works or deeds of any religious law', thereby placing everyone on equal ground in terms of salvation, with all who simply 'love their neighbor as themselves' (Galatians 5.14) receiving eternal life. Therefore, we must ultimately recognize that, Catholicism, through their 'works or deeds of the Catholic law' (i.e., all of their sacraments, sacrifices, ceremonies, litanies, and Masses), has ignored and rejected the true Good News of the New Covenant, doing just as the proud and boastful Jews that Paul was addressing, thereby believing that they will be saved (or justified) by their sacraments, when in reality it is by their idolatrous sacraments that they may receive eternal damnation. It is by the Catholic sacraments (i.e., 'works or deeds of the Catholic law' such as receiving the Eucharist and Confession) that Catholics 'boast in supremacy', ultimately (usually silently) persecuting and hating, in a hidden and unspoken way, many outside of Catholicism (i.e., 'no salvation outside of Catholicism'), thereby hating God (see James 3.9) and essentially sentencing themselves to eternal damnation; acting in essence identically to the Jews of

2000 years ago. Thus, just as the 'deeds of the <u>Jewish</u> law' kept the Jews <u>blind</u> to the true Good News of equality and freedom, the 'deeds of the <u>Catholic</u> law' keep Catholics, especially the hierarchy, <u>blind</u> to the fact that they have created their own **defiled version** of the Good News, <u>the Anti-Good News</u>, thereby creating <u>supremacy</u> and <u>enslavement</u>, and ultimately <u>division</u> and <u>war</u>, out of something that was designed to create <u>equality</u> and <u>freedom</u>, and ultimately <u>unity</u> and <u>peace</u>.

If Catholics are ever to truly follow Christ, they must come to the realization that they are just like the Jews of 2000 years ago who practiced their 'deeds of the law' and thought that by doing so they were serving God, when in reality they were serving Satan by blindly practicing supremacy and exclusion towards the Gentiles. That is, Catholics must come to the realization that, while they think their sacraments and other religious deeds are spiritual blessings, they are in fact the root of their spiritual <u>blindness</u>. Consequently, the Catholic sacraments are also at the root of many inner conflicts between a Catholic's heart and mind. On one hand, a Catholic is told 'salvation only comes through the Catholic sacraments'; these are the seeds of supremacy and exclusion planted in the minds of many Catholics at a very young age (say 5 to 8 years old). On the other hand, the hearts of many Catholics cannot believe that God would condemn non-Catholics to eternal damnation. Therefore, many Catholics show up every week and perform their weekly obligations (i.e., 'deeds') out of the fear of eternal damnation placed in their minds at such a young age. The problem is that, over many years of performing weekly obligations, Catholics start to believe, just as the Jews of Jesus' day, that 'salvation is theirs alone, or is exclusive to them, through deeds of the Catholic law'. That is, the lies planted in people's minds start to choke out the truth written on their hearts, and their hearts become hardened; i.e., religious ideologies harden people's hearts. So we must recognize that many Catholics (as well as many other deeply religious people) go throughout life serving 2 consciences: the 1st true conscience in their heart that follows the one true God, and a 2nd false conscience, which is perceived by their mind as also being 'written on their heart by God'. We can refer to this as a 2nd false conscience in a person's mind; as we feel this conscience based on 'what men have taught our minds (i.e., their false covenant of man-made beliefs)', not what we are internally hardwired to feel by our true conscience (i.e., the true New Covenant of God's laws). And so Catholics (or any religious person) must ask themselves, 'If my heart conflicts with Catholic doctrine (or any religious doctrine), what does that say about the doctrine?' Maybe it's not the doctrine of **God**, but the doctrine of **men**. Remember, your heart is smarter than your mind (unless it's fully hardened), sensing things that are wrong which your mind cannot yet compute or understand. Therefore, if you as a Catholic cannot tell even your closest non-Catholic friend that 'they are going to hell for not being Catholic' - keeping in mind that this applies to all religions who teach supremacy and exclusion - you must understand that it is God in your heart, your true conscience, that is stopping you from **condemning** innocent people. It is God in your heart that is stopping you from **propagating** the Catholic Anti-Good News which states that 'man is justified only through deeds of the Catholic law'. Thus, quite simply, if you cannot 'shout the Catholic Good News from the rooftops', then it is **not** the **true** Good News, but rather the **Anti-Good News** (a message of supremacy and exclusion); and your heart has already identified it, whether or not your mind is yet to be able to fully understand their mysterious, hidden wickedness.

In order to **destroy** your false conscience that follows man-made beliefs, bringing about inner **unity** (between your heart and mind) where there was once inner conflict, you must 'plant your mind firmly in your heart'. Your heart is where the truth of one unified God resides, but your mind is where many false gods reside. I.e., your mind is where many false man-made belief systems - which Satan creates to cause normalized confusion and chaos - reside. Satan plants varying false gods in everyone's mind when they are young. These false gods, which are really just barriers of **exclusion** based on a certain supremacy (noting that many of these barriers of exclusion present themselves when people want to marry others outside of their religion, race, or class), cannot be crossed without us perceiving ourselves as going against God. This is Satan's best trick, as he wants to be thought of as God. By Satan creating 'a false god in your mind that you perceive as actually being the one true God', he enslaves you (i.e., your false conscience) to false man-made beliefs of supremacy, which become barriers that cause you to 'exclude all who do not follow the same false man-made system of beliefs'. And of course, if Satan can create enough false gods in each of our minds, we will all blindly exclude one another, with each person looking at the other *as if* they are **not** following the one true God, when the whole time, we are all following <u>different</u> individual false gods. As Micah 4.5 says, "For all people walk <u>each</u> in the name of his (own) qod". This is why you should 'plant your mind firmly in your heart', and not harden your heart. God speaks more in feeling, through your heart, than in the word; and so He speaks 'through your heart' to get to your mind. If your heart is hardened, then you have basically shut the mouth of God, and the only voice you listen to anymore is Satan, the false god in your mind, who has disguised himself as the one true God. Thus you should **never persevere** in an idea 'from your mind'; only persevere in an idea 'from your heart'. Satan uses 'positive negativity' - positively encouraging someone into doing what is negative, wrong, evil, or simply a dead end - to secretly advance his hidden agenda in your mind. Satan will tell your mind 'God (which is really Satan in disquise) doesn't want you to quit, keep qoing'. This positive negativity is what drives a priest to 'become a priest in the first place'. But you must understand that Satan is more sadistic than you can imagine, and knows **no boundaries**, preying on a priest's deepest desire for social acceptance, and using it against them. Therefore Catholic priests, as well as all other religious leaders, should ask themselves 'Have I shut the mouth of the one true God, only to listen to Satan's false god in my mind that promises me praise and glory from my fellow man?'; remembering that Jesus says "Woe to you when all men speak well of you, for so did their fathers to the false prophets" (Luke 6.26). By hardening their hearts to the voice of God, the Catholic hierarchy (as well as all other religious hierarchies) have gone off and followed the false gods which Satan has created in their minds, thereby ultimately opposing the God that they say they exalt, and consequently becoming false prophets who believe that they are true Prophets; noting that all false prophets of the past thought they too were true Prophets, as Satan made them believe in their minds that he was the one true God.

One of the hardest concepts for any of the Catholic hierarchy to accept is the fact that, as many times as they use the name of Jesus, they are indeed just a <u>mere continuation</u> of the Jewish hierarchy that condemned Jesus 2000 years ago. They are a <u>mere continuation</u> of the religious leaders who <u>rejected</u> the teaching of Christ because His Good News meant 'the <u>end</u> of their deeds of the law', and <u>consequently</u> 'the <u>end</u> of their supposedly <u>necessary positions</u> as **false mediators** between God and His

people'. Essentially, if the Good News states 'an end for the necessity to perform religious rituals in order to attain salvation', then the religious leaders are 'put out of a job' and they no longer receive the praise and glory that they have become accustomed to receiving (see Matthew 23.5-7). Don't be deceived. The recognition of 'the deeds of any religious law' is 'the WOrship of the men administering the deeds' - i.e., 'they want all their <u>WOrks of the law</u> to be <u>seen by men</u>' (Matthew 23.5) - it is <u>not</u> 'the true worship of God'; which is simply 'loving others as yourself', as God is within others. The recognition of 'the deeds of <u>any</u> religious law' is 'the worship of the men administering the deeds and their <u>false set of</u> man-made beliefs that they have named God in order to deceive us'. And so in the interest of their own glory, and having people 'worship them' by disguising it as 'the worship of God and Jesus', the Catholic Forefathers (i.e., antichrists) picked up right where the Jewish hierarchy left off 1800 to 1900 years ago, installing (through the gross misinterpretation of Christ's words) their 'deeds of the law' under a different name (i.e., Catholicism), and claiming that their 'new deeds' were initiated and instituted by Christ. But the Catholic sacraments and ceremonies - deeds based on 'Catholicism's law of mortal sins and prejudgments' - actually opposed the true Good News of Christ, and these 'new deeds' (i.e., sacraments) were instituted by the Catholic Forefathers in order to ensure allegiance to them, thereby securing their power and authority over men and nations through basically 'the worship of men' that is disguised as 'the worship of God'. This 'worship of men' disguised as 'the worship of God' is at the heart of the Catholic Anti-Good News, and it is nothing more than Satan's normalized prison that he has created in the name of God and Christ; it is nothing more than 'the enslavement to men' that is disguised as 'the enslavement to God and Christ'. Do not believe the Catholic hierarchy when they say 'This is the way it is supposed to be'. They hold the entire world enslaved to a lie, saying, 'There is no salvation without bowing to the men of the Catholic hierarchy'. Remember, 1 John 5.19 says "The whole world lies under the sway of the Wicked One". And so the Catholic hierarchy has 'caged us like animals'

under the <u>disguise</u> of 'preaching the Good News and <u>serving God</u> and <u>Christ</u>'. Remember, Jesus says that "The time will come when those who kill you (i.e., <u>enslave</u> and <u>oppress</u> you) will <u>think</u> that by doing this they are <u>serving God</u>" (John 16.2). Thus, the 'deeds of the <u>Catholic</u> law' - their sacraments, ceremonies, and Masses which are a <u>mere continuation</u> of the 'deeds of the <u>Jewish</u> law' from 2000 years ago - are the embodiment of the <u>Anti-Good News</u>: a message that uses 'the name and words of Christ and His Apostles', while simultaneously preaching the <u>exact opposite</u> (i.e., 'anti') of Christ's true message, thereby <u>enslaving us</u> with what was designed to <u>free us</u>.

with their false doctrine, and they teach and train us with absolute and proud certainty, just as any animal born into <u>captivity</u> is trained to believe, 'This <u>cage</u> is your true home; this is the way it's supposed to be'. They peddle their darkness as light, and **deceive** us into accepting their darkness as if it is light, all

People who abide by Catholicism's Anti-Good News live in a <u>worldwide spiritual prison</u>, unknowingly participating in '<u>the worship of men'</u>' that is <u>disguised</u> as '<u>the worship of God'</u>, thereby being enslaved to a false set of man-made beliefs (i.e., a false god) that has been created by the Catholic hierarchy. If you try to oppose the **false god** 'Catholicism' - which the Catholic hierarchy has installed in your mind as being the one true **God** - they will 'guilt you' back into their domain (i.e., their cage) with man-made doctrine in order to keep you enslaved for Satan; whom they unknowingly serve. And so the Catholic Anti-Good News is <u>slavery</u> for all who abide by their doctrine and religious deeds. But the <u>true</u> Good

News of the New Covenant is **freedom** for all who believe; realizing that the true Good News is 'freedom **from** man-made religion', **not** 'the freedom **of** man-made religion'. I.e., **the true Good News** is simply 'the end of religion', as religion enslaves under the cloak of liberty. The true Good News, as opposed to Catholicism's Anti-Good News, is a message that can be 'shouted from the rooftops', and be told to <u>anyone</u> on the planet. The true Good News is an 'all inclusive', universal message of true peace and unity with no strings attached. There are no rituals, no papers to sign, no prayers or petitions to offer, because everyone is already a member simply by being a human being. No one is **excluded** because everyone is born as equals. That is, <u>no one is **excluded**</u> because every human being is already 'born equal of water', and therefore no outward 'baptism of water' (another 'deed of the Catholic law') is necessary or even wanted by God (see Section 13). The true Good News states that, by 'deeds of any religious law' - whether baptism, circumcision, confession, receiving the Eucharist, etc. no one is justified before God, and no one is seen as a superior to another; of course leading us to the conclusion that 'deeds of <u>any</u> religious law' is the same as magic, witchcraft, and sorcery that has been normalized with the names of God and Jesus. Thus, the true Good News, as opposed to Catholicism's Anti-Good News that falsely justifies man based on worthless pagan 'deeds of the Catholic law', is an all inclusive, universal message of true peace and unity in which everyone who simply 'loves their neighbor as themselves' and 'judges their neighbor the way that they want to be judged' - which is the true worship of God - will be justified. And this is the Good News that will, upon the return of Christ, Unite humanity as one, with one God.

13. Equality: the True Meaning of Water Baptism

Nothing that is outward can affect what is inward (Mark 7.18-19). This basic reasoning, taught by Christ, opposes the Catholic assertion that 'eating the Eucharist (i.e., something outward) can affect or cleanse your soul (i.e., something inward)'. And so, this is also the same simple teaching that opposes the Catholic assertion that 'pouring water on someone and saying a few choice incantations, as done in today's water baptism, can somehow cleanse a person's soul of original sin'; momentarily ignoring that the idea of 'original sin' is yet again another fabrication of the Catholic hierarchy to maintain their **necessary** position in the chain of salvation. Therefore, just as nothing you eat (such as the Eucharist) can have any effect on your salvation or bring any spiritual profit, as if being spiritually charged food, **nothing** you put **on** your body can affect your salvation either. This includes things such as 'pouring' water on someone or immersion in water as done in water baptism', 'applying oil on someone as done in the <u>anointing of the sick</u>', 'the applying of <u>holy water</u>', or 'the slathering of anything of any kind on one's body', as if any of these different substances can be spiritually charged, and hence spiritually profitable. While all of these things may make someone feel better or at peace, leading them to believe that their salvation has been affected, to make these things necessary for salvation, as Catholicism has done, opens the door to making 'anything that makes us feel better or at peace', such as drinking a beer or walking by a mountain stream, also necessary for salvation, thereby essentially mandating that anyone 'not drinking beer' or 'not walking by mountain streams' will go to hell. And so to believe that 'what is <u>outward</u> can affect what is <u>inward</u> in terms of a man's salvation', is to believe in <u>foolish</u> nonsense that ultimately equates to normalized magic, witchcraft, and sorcery; remembering that Revelation 18.23 and 19.20 says 'All the nations were <u>deceived</u> by the <u>sorcery</u> of the harlot and the Beast', and noting that the sorcery in the Catholic Church is also practiced by all other religions in different various forms and 'deeds of their own religious law'. Therefore, to believe that water baptism (referring to one of many 'dead works of the Catholic law' that we have inherited from the Catholic Forefathers, not Jesus) can affect a person's soul, thereby allowing them to enter into heaven, is to believe in something that opposes the very essence of Christ's teaching - not to mention opposing our own God-given common sense, logic, and reason - and is to believe in sorcery that has been normalized over many centuries with the names of God and Jesus. And so, contrary to believing that 'Catholicism's dead works of normalized sorcery' will in some way allow someone to enter through the gates of heaven, the last page of the Bible actually says 'Sorcerers will remain outside of the gates of heaven' (Revelation 22.15). We must face the fact that, as impossible as it seems to be unknowingly practicing **SOFCETY** in today's <u>supposedly</u> 'informed world', Satan has tricked us into doing just that by <u>disguising</u> his 'dead works of normalized sorcery' with the names of Jesus and God, thereby making us all out to be blind fools. Again, nothing that is outward (i.e., 'Catholicism's dead works of normalized sorcery') can affect what is **inward**.

So <u>how</u> is it possible that we are practicing <u>normalized sorcery</u> in today's <u>supposedly</u> <u>educated</u> and <u>informed world</u>, and <u>not even realizing it</u>? The answer is quite simply <u>tradition</u>. We are <u>blinded by our traditions</u> because they are <u>normal to us</u>. A tradition is something that is very <u>normal</u> to you, yet may seem <u>abnormal</u> to someone else. It is a mindset passed from <u>one generation to the next</u>, and

something you were raised doing simply because your ancestors did the same thing. Remember, the tradition of 'worshiping a golden calf' was something that the 2nd and 3rd generation 'post-Jeroboam' Samaritans' were raised doing, making it seem very normal and right. Therefore, in many cases, a tradition is all you have ever known so you don't really question it; you just do it just as you have been instructed by your ancestors, <u>naïvely assuming</u> - just as the 'post-Jeroboam Samaritans' did - that your ancestors were righteous people with righteous motives. But you never knew your ancestors or their true motives. Whether we want to believe it or not, the reality is that our ancestors may have done foolish things by allowing seeds of error to sprout in their day. Now in our day, we see that error, fully grown. But since they are 'our' ancestors, we accept 'what they did' as being righteous, much like you might accept something wrong that your own parents might do, yet you would not accept the same if it were done by the parents of someone in a foreign country. So we are blinded by our traditions because they were instituted by people 'on our side' so to speak. And since our traditions have been normalized by centuries of previous people who also agree that our traditions are righteous - making them 'time honored traditions' - it can become quite easy to 'blindly accept something that is wrong' while 'believing it is <u>right</u>'. As Paul says in Colossians 2.8 "Beware lest anyone **cheat** you through philosophy and empty deceit, according to the tradition of men". Therefore, we are blinded, and hence easily cheated and deceived, by the mindset of 'passing on a time honored tradition', much like 'passing on the torch', and we can't see that this 'supposed honor of receiving the torch' is actually a 'false honor' that blinds our minds to the truth that is in our hearts. Consider if you met one of your ancestors, and they turned out to be someone totally different (in a bad way) than what you were told about them. Consider if someone you had heard great things about your entire life turned out to be a liar, a cheat, and a **thief**. If this were to happen, would you not <u>reconsider</u> 'why you do the things you do', knowing that those things (i.e., your 'time honored traditions') Originated from this lying, cheating, and stealing ancestor. Therefore, if we never **question** 'who our ancestors were', 'what their motives were', and 'why they began our traditions in the first place', we (just as the Samaritans) may blindly pass on evil traditions to the next generation, all because we have been brainwashed from the time of our childhood that 'they are good traditions given to us by righteous ancestors'. And so we must come to the understanding that the <u>religious traditions</u> handed down to us by our ancestors - i.e., our religious 'deeds or works of the law' that honor man while pretending to honor God with meaningless words (Mark 7.6) - are nothing more than normalized sorcery and spells that have been instituted in the names of Jesus and God with the **intent** and **motivation** to 'create supremacy and oppression over others' (i.e., to enslave others); and this ultimately leads to 'division, war, and hate', which of course is the antithesis of Christ's message of equality and freedom that leads to peace under one unified God. Thus, the normalized sorcery passed down to us as holy tradition from our ancestors makes the word and message of Christ **null** and **void** (Mark 7.13).

It is important to realize that, when Jesus said to the Pharisees and Scribes 'You make the word of God of <u>no effect</u> through your <u>tradition</u>' (Mark 7.13), He was speaking to people who were considered wise and educated; and those people were <u>usually elders</u>. The reason Jesus targeted the elders was that <u>the elders</u> were responsible for the <u>hardened hearts</u> and <u>traditional strongholds</u> that were imprisoning <u>people's souls</u> and making them judge others (in particular the Gentiles and Samaritans) with supremacy

and exclusion, while **simultaneously** making them believe that 'their supremacy and exclusion, in some twisted way, aligned with the righteousness of God'. The elders kept the traditions alive, knowing that a certain authority and glory was granted to them by practicing and administering the 'deeds of the law' that were associated with their traditions. Living 2000 years in the future, we underestimate the gravity of this situation. Imagine in today's world, a 30-year-old Carpenter who holds no man-made certificate or PhD in theology, opposing and correcting an entire hierarchy of men, made up of mostly elders of say 50 to 80 years old, who all hold doctorates in theology. This is what happened 2000 years ago, and as you might expect, when it happens again in our own day, our religious elders with doctorates will not believe Christ out of shear arrogance and pride; and of course in the interest of preserving their own inflated egos that are disguised with false humility. So we must realize that our religious elders of today are <u>no different</u> than the religious elders that Jesus opposed and corrected **2000 years ago**. To confuse matters, our religious elders say 'We could never oppose Christ', and 'We exalt Christ'. But when Christ returns, it will become obvious that our religious leaders of today are identical to the religious elders of 2000 years ago; they merely keep themselves hidden behind the name of Christ. Think about it. When Christ returns we will see our religious elders blindly trying to 'teach Christ about Christ', realizing that 'the Christ which they themselves have been taught' is 'a false version of Christ'; i.e., Satan's imposter persona of Christ. Therefore, as much as we have been raised with the mindset that 'you must respect your elders', we must come to grips with the reality that to truly emulate Christ, we must **oppose** and **correct** our elders for the **evil traditions** which they have blindly passed on to us as **good** traditions. To truly emulate Christ, we must speak harshly to our elders and chastise them for their own good, treating them as if they are unknowing children, and understanding that there comes a time when 'truly respecting your elders' means 'opposing and correcting your elders'.

So through our blind elders, we (being the blind followers) blindly receive evil traditions, which we think are good traditions, and then in turn (when we become elders) blindly pass on those same evil traditions, still thinking they are good traditions. This 'blind receiving and passing on of evil (yet time honored) traditions from one generation to the next' is considered ancestral sin: the wrong thought patterns or Sins of our ancestors that we blindly accept as being right thought patterns, thereby **unknowingly** propagating them from one generation to the next. And so we may harbor 'a wrong thought pattern that we think is right' simply because it has been handed down to us as a great, time honored tradition. But in actuality, we have inherited our ancestor's wrong thoughts, or their sins, hence the name 'ancestral sin'. It is important to understand that ancestral sin is something that has been 'marketed and sold' to us since childhood as 'something we should be proud of'. Ancestral sin is something that has been 'marketed and sold' to us by 'family, church, or society' as being normal and righteous, and so we 'buy' their sin (i.e., their wrong thought patterns); of course usually being subconsciously pressured (by family, church, or society) into submission, and being told that their ancestral sin is 'the only way'. As an example, think of 'slavery in the Southern United States'. This was a normalized tradition of sorts that is all people knew from the time of their childhood. Consequently, this 'time honored tradition' produced many racial bigots who actually thought that their enslavement and oppression of Black Americans was righteous and normal before God... just as the Catholic hierarchy also believes that their **enslavement** and **oppression** of the worldwide multitudes is righteous and normal before God. And so it is a very sobering notion to think that our ancestors have done evil things to satisfy their own selfish agendas, and then consequently passed down wrong thought patterns to blind future generations; although, if you read the Old Testament (i.e., Jeremiah 16.19), 'the sins of the fathers' is a **recurring theme**. Therefore, we must realize that we are <u>no different</u> than the people in the Old Testament, and we <u>too</u> have received from our fathers (our ancestors) a **poisoned inheritance**. We too have received from our fathers 'ancestral sin': inherited sins that our ancestors committed which we must 'bear the consequences of' in our present age. As Lamentations 5.7 says "Our fathers sinned and are no more, but we bear their iniquities". So just because people (our ancestors) have died, it does not mean that we are no longer responsible for their sins. I.e., the concept that 'we are all one body of people' is a constant that remains, and just because our ancestors have died (as this is referring to physical death, <u>not spiritual death</u>), it does not mean that they are no longer 'part of the body'. Thus, we are <u>still</u> responsible for resolving the iniquity of our forefathers, because it still affects us today. And, if we can identify our ancestral sin, then we can destroy it before it passes to the next generation.

God places a unique soul in every person, independent of physical bloodlines and DNA. Just because you physically came from someone's seed 100 or even 1000 years ago, your spirit (or soul) is completely unique and unfettered by their physical seed. I.e., you are not your ancestor, and your physical bloodline is something *outward* and *fleshy* that cannot affect what is *inward* and *spiritual*. What does fetter, or enslave a person's inward spirit, is a wrong inherited mindset based on the sins of an ancestor (i.e., a wrong thought pattern that a person received as ancestral sin). Essentially, a wrong inherited mindset of an ancestor, whether family, church, or societal, is passed on to a person, and they cannot see that it's wrong because it is all they have ever known, and so it keeps them unknowingly enslaved. In John 8.31-59, because the Jews were enslaved to a wrong inherited mindset of supremacy and **exclusion**, Jesus said 'If you abide in My word, you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you <u>free</u>'. And of course, Jesus' truth is that '<u>we are all born **equally** of **water**</u>', which, if believed or 'abided by', would destroy the Jew's inherited wrong mindset (i.e., ancestral sin that taught supremacy over and **exclusion** of the Gentiles in the name of God), thereby setting them free. But the Jews, because their hearts were hardened and their minds blinded, could not understand that which was enslaving them (i.e., their spirits), and so responded by saying 'We are from the physical seed of Abraham, therefore we are <u>not</u>, and have <u>never been **enslaved**</u>'; noting that this is the same twisted logic as a person saying 'I know about medicine or farming because my dad was a doctor or a farmer', even though they themselves have never done any medical work or farming. And so we must understand that, because the Jews could trace their **physical bloodlines** back to a 'righteous ancestor' (i.e., Abraham), they consequently thought - with the same twisted reasoning as 'My dad was a doctor, so I know about medicine' - that they were somehow impervious to being enslaved by sin, and were hence righteous. Therefore, Jesus was essentially conveying that 'each person's righteousness or unrighteousness is in no way affected by one's physical bloodline'. I.e., the physical seed or lineage of Abraham was Irrelevant to their salvation. And, interestingly enough, it was the traditions that were started by their 'post-Abraham Jewish ancestors' - which were spoken and instituted in the name of

Abraham - that were the <u>cause</u> of their <u>spiritual enslavement</u>; ironically meaning that, because they put so much <u>blind trust</u> in the <u>name</u> of Abraham, evil men (speaking <u>from behind</u> Abraham's name) easily started evil traditions that enslaved the souls of their descendants, with those descendants truly **thinking** that they were doing what Abraham did, while **actually** doing quite the <u>opposite</u> (see verse 40). Thus, our <u>souls</u> are <u>unique</u> and <u>independent</u> of any physical bloodline, or <u>any</u> type of <u>lineage</u> (i.e., Catholicism's supposed lineage to Peter), that we may perceive as controlling us in the spiritual, mental, or emotional realm. But, what <u>does</u> control us in the spiritual, mental, and emotional realm is the <u>traditions</u> passed down to us as <u>ancestral sin</u>. Our ancestral sin, based on <u>time honored tradition</u>, is what makes God's Commandments <u>null</u> and <u>void</u>, while simultaneously being marketed and sold as <u>something that upholds</u> God's Commandments. This is why Jesus said to the Pharisees and Scribes, 'You make the Commandments of God of no effect (i.e., null and void) <u>through your tradition</u> which you have handed down" (Mark 7.13).

Therefore, we should not buy into the <u>common misconception</u> that the Bible tells us to *'blindly stick with our family and traditions'*. That is a <u>lie</u> that keeps us <u>afraid</u> of questioning and testing our ancestors, and their <u>supposedly</u> righteous traditions; i.e., <u>Catholic water baptism</u> and any of their other *'dead works of normalized sorcery'*. Jesus Himself recognizes the <u>barriers</u> that <u>family</u> and <u>tradition</u> can inflict on a person, saying, *"I did not come to bring peace but a <u>sword</u>. <u>For I have come to Set a man</u>

<u>against his father</u>, and a <u>daughter against her mother</u>. A man's <u>enemies</u> will be <u>those of his own household</u>" (Matthew 10.34-36; see also 10.21). Most often, the problems that people face, whether in health, happiness, freedom, liberty, etc., are due to their <u>blind acceptance</u> of '<u>doing things</u>' the <u>Same way their parents and their grandparents did things'</u>. And so one of the hardest realities to face is that the <u>ancestral sin</u> passed on to us under the cloak of '<u>family</u> and <u>tradition</u>' is in fact what keeps us <u>spiritually blind</u> and <u>enslaved</u>. That is:*

<u>family and tradition</u> = <u>blindness and enslavement</u>

Family, church, or community **sponsored** 'bad traditions that propagate wrong thought patterns' are at the <u>root</u> of the **ancestral sin** which keeps us spiritually blind and enslaved. This is why Paul, after receiving spiritual sight, said 'God <u>separated</u> me from my <u>mother's teaching</u>, or her <u>figurative womb</u>, and the <u>traditions</u> of my <u>forefathers'</u> (Galatians 1.14-15); implying that, by doing this, Paul was in fact **figuratively** being 'born of the <u>Spirit's womb'</u>. Therefore we must recognize that ancestral sin is <u>not</u> something that we are <u>born with</u> (as in the idea of <u>original sin</u>), but <u>rather</u> something we are <u>born into</u> and slowly absorb, from family and tradition, into our minds as we gain the ability to speak and communicate as a child; i.e., ancestral sin is a condition that affects our minds. And so again, knowing <u>ancestral sin</u> is a <u>mental barrier</u> that we <u>cannot cross</u> because of <u>family</u> and <u>tradition</u>, one of the hardest realities to face is that our <u>own</u> people from family, church, or community, and their <u>inherited traditions</u>, are the <u>cause</u> of our spiritual blindness, death, desolation, and enslavement; i.e., we must recognize that essentially '<u>tradition kills'</u>'. We must recognize that it is 'our <u>fear</u> of crossing the mental barriers installed by our own people' which keeps us 'prisoners within our own bodies'; or as Paul

implies 'trapped in his mother's figurative womb'. What will our parents think? What will our church think? What will our community think if we cross the lines of tradition? As an example, consider what the grandfather of one of our Founding Fathers would say about 'going against the Crown of Britain'. Our Founding Fathers surely must have felt pressure from certain family and friends about breaking <u>normalized tradition</u> to go against 'the passed down mindset of pledging allegiance to a King or a Queen (which includes our hidden kings)'. Therefore, it is important that we identify the fact that people such as Jesus, the Prophets, Martin Luther, and our American Founding Fathers were all viewed as **defiant** to their elders and leaders, and in many respects viewed as **traders**. And we must identify (in retrospect) that these people were actually 'honoring mother, father, leaders, and elders' more than they could understand by 'defying them and the traditions based on the sins of their ancestors'. Thus, Jesus said 'I come with a sword to divide a man from his father and mother' (Matthew 10.34-35) because most often it is 'through the father and mother' that we receive ancestral sin; i.e., we are born into ancestral sin, not with ancestral sin. To stay within, and accept the boundaries and barriers of our family and traditions, is to remain blindly enslaved to ancestral sin, and to accept that 'division and dissension based on ancestral sin is normal and right'. Jesus, the Prophets, Martin Luther, and our American Founding Fathers all crossed the lines of family and tradition to get us where we are today. If we are to complete what they started, we must question, test, and destroy evil traditions (i.e., ancestral sin) that cause 'division, war, and hate'.

It is important to know the difference between original sin and ancestral sin. Original sin is Catholicism's twisted and warped false belief that 'a newborn's soul enters this world pre-stained with the sins of our ancestors (namely Adam and Eve)'; which contradicts the previously mentioned idea that 'a person's soul, and consequently their righteousness, is independent, and unfettered by the bloodline of our ancestors'. Conversely, ancestral sin is very real and is 'the slow, blind acceptance of the error of our ancestors over the course of our lives'; of course under the influence of family and tradition. As Jeremiah 16.19 says, "Surely our fathers have inherited lies"... which they blindly pass on to us. Original sin is not mentioned in the Bible, while ancestral sin is the underlying reason why people continually fall into idolatry throughout the entire **Old Testament**. **Ancestral sin** is 'a state of mind', while original <u>sin</u> is the **perceived** idea that 'a sort of <u>fictitious</u>, <u>inward</u> <u>black mark</u>, which can somehow be removed by the <u>outward</u> pouring of water, is on our soul from birth'. And to think that this 'fictitious, inward black mark' is somehow removed once we 'outwardly pour water on a person and speak the magic words', is to believe in a mindset of sorcery, witchcraft, and superstition; which is not the mindset of Jesus that asserts 'nothing that is Outward can affect what is inward' (Mark 7.18-19). Ancestral sin is the result of our ancestors 'figuratively eating from Satan's tree of false knowledge', just like Adam and Eve, then <u>passing</u> that <u>false knowledge</u> down to us <u>as true knowledge</u> and <u>time honored traditions</u>. The story of Adam and Eve tells us that we are all metaphorically blind and ignorant (or 'naked') to the fact that Satan tempts us with 'the fruit of false knowledge' which is disguised as true knowledge. Once (if ever) we realize that we have 'eaten Satan's false knowledge' - that is, absorbed his lies into our minds we will gain sight and look down in shame at our ignorance (or 'nakedness'). So the **only cure** for ancestral sin - which is 'the unknowing consumption of false knowledge' - is to 'consume', 'eat', or

<u>'absorb into our minds'</u> true knowledge. This why Jesus said 'You must <u>eat</u> My flesh and drink My blood to receive eternal life'. I.e., 'You must consume the <u>true knowledge</u> of Jesus' <u>words</u>, and <u>believe in</u> (or <u>concede to</u>) those words, in order to enter through the gates of heaven' (see Section 7). And so <u>knowledge absorbed into our minds - NOt</u> the <u>outward sprinkling of water as in water baptism - is the only cure for ancestral sin</u>, and is also 'the <u>key</u> to the gates of heaven' (see Section 10). As Hosea 6.6 says - regarding worthless 'deeds of the law' (such as Catholic water baptism), which only amount to normalized sorcery - "For I (God) desire mercy and <u>not</u> sacrifice (a 'deed of the law'), and the <u>knowledge</u> of God more than burnt offerings (a 'deed of the law')".

The idea of original sin is a **fabrication** by the Catholic hierarchy, once again, to ensure their own authority, power, and glory. They have created the notion that every person is born with 'an impurity on their soul' that can Only be removed 'by them' through water baptism, thereby defiling the true meaning of water baptism into a false, made-up cure for a false, made-up disease (i.e., original sin). And so, as the Catholic hierarchy focuses their attention on the normalized sorcery of Catholic water <u>baptism</u>, thinking that 'the outward sprinkling of spiritually charged water' is some type of 'spiritual protection policy and the cure for original sin', they, by their very actions of performing water baptism and other various 'dead works of normalized sorcery' (i.e., their sacraments), can't see that they have become **full** of ancestral sin. The Catholic hierarchy can't see that, while a **baby** is born **innocent** and sinless, it is the very traditions (i.e., Catholicism's sacraments of supremacy and boasting) that a child starts to absorb as they grow up which instills in them more and more ancestral sin. As a child grows up, they become exposed to normalized bad traditions that enslave their spirit by instilling a wrong thought pattern. These wrong thought patterns (or inherited ancestral sin) become mental barriers that cannot be crossed; eventually enslaving the person to 'a lifetime of wrong thought patterns'. Therefore, we must recognize that, while the Catholic hierarchy thinks that they 'remove sin' through water baptism and the Sacrament of Confession, it is in fact the Catholic hierarchy, by their propagation of Catholic sacraments, that is responsible for 'instilling and perpetuating a mountain of ancestral sin'; which they of course disguise as sacred tradition, just as the Pharisees did in Jesus' day. And if you attempt to cross the lines of their sacred tradition, then you are immediately branded as a heretic. You are branded as abnormal, when it is actually them with the abnormality. Remember, Satan convinced the Pharisees and other Jews that 'Jesus was an abnormal heretic and a deceiver who was sent by Satan' (see Matthew 12.24 & 27.63, and John 8.48). I.e., Satan can convince you to 'look Jesus straight in the eye and <u>call Jesus 'Satan</u>'. So, as Catholicism is Satan's greatest puppet, convincing anyone trying to cross their lines of sacred tradition that they are following Satan, we must recognize that, in truth, it is Catholicism's sacred, time honored tradition that is the cause of inherited ancestral sin and wrong thought patterns; which of course will ultimately make people blindly label their Savior as a blaspheming heretic, just as they did 2000 years ago. Thus, we must be able to identify that original sin is a fabrication of Catholicism which has been created by the Catholic hierarchy to secure their own unrighteous authority, telling people that they are the only ones with the cure, when in actuality, by making people believe in such things as 'original sin and the SUPremacy of Catholic water baptism', the Catholic hierarchy are the ones who instill in people (as they grow up) the disease of ancestral sin.

And, while 'there is <u>no such thing</u> as <u>original sin'</u> - i.e., it is an impurity that <u>never existed</u> - there is a very real <u>ancestral sin</u> that exists, and is not given much attention, as many people wrongly consider 'original sin and ancestral sin' as being 'the <u>same</u> thing'. Additionally it must be noted that, if people <u>do</u> understand the concept that 'people harbor the sins of their ancestors', then they most likely <u>don't</u> consider ancestral sin to <u>affect their own lives</u>. I.e., many people can <u>easily recognize</u> how 'others <u>blindly</u> follow bad traditions', but can't possibly fathom that 'their <u>own</u> time honored traditions are <u>also</u> <u>bad</u>'; that is, they can't fathom that 'they <u>too</u> are <u>blind</u>'.

Consider the following. If John the Baptist started the tradition of baptizing with water, then why did he **not** simply say 'I came <u>baptizing</u> with water to remove original sin'? Remember that 'what is <u>not</u> said' in the Bible (such as 'original sin itself' or 'water baptism to remove anything') can be just as important as 'what is said'. Knowing that John, or anybody else, never mentioned 'the removal of original sin with water baptism', the Catholic Church will still assert that 'John implied that the true intention of water baptism is the removal of original sin'. Thus, having the Catholic Church make this assertion actually brings to light an enormous contradiction in their teaching on baptism. Luke 3.21 says "When all the people were baptized, it came to pass that **Jesus also was baptized**". If the Catholic Church's interpretation of 'John baptizing others with water' was so that 'their original sin would be removed', then why was Jesus baptized? The Catholic Church claims (because it is also not in the Bible) that everyone, except for Jesus and Mary, was born with the impurity of original sin. So Why would Jesus be baptized to remove original sin if He never had original sin? By making the assertion that 'water baptism removes original sin', then the Catholic Church is left implying that 'Jesus was born impure, with original sin, and hence the need for Him to be baptized'. Yet they simultaneously, and double mindedly, assert that 'Jesus had no original sin'. That's why nothing about original sin, even within Catholicism's own doctrine, makes any sense whatsoever. Surely the Catholic hierarchy will say 'Water baptism does remove original sin, and Jesus was simply <u>setting an **example** for us</u>'. If this is so, then how does the Catholic hierarchy explain Jesus setting the example of 'not observing the Sabbath' (see John 9.16), which opposes Catholicism's mandatory weekly obligation to attend Mass under pain of mortal sin? That is, by Catholic logic, Jesus set the example of 'not attending Mass', therefore we should also 'not attend Mass'. And so, like most other Catholic doctrine, the idea that 'water baptism is something essential for salvation because it removes original sin' does not make any sense. The Catholic Church is 'clueless' as to the true meaning of water baptism (which is equality and inclusion), as they use Catholic water baptism to actually promote the supremacy and exclusiveness of their religion, making it a 'symbol of supremacy'. And their false interpreted meaning - which implies their exclusive ability to cure the 'made-up disease', original sin - is nothing more than another fabricated fear tactic used to secure their own glory of being sole mediator and lifeline between us and God. Thus, the Catholic Church's version of water baptism does not remove original sin, as 'there is no such thing as original sin', but rather instills in people the supremacy of 'being Catholic and 1st in line for salvation' - which instills in people Catholic ancestral sin - and makes null and void Jesus' true intentions for water baptism.

So if original sin does not exist, but ancestral sin does exist, what then was Jesus' true intention and purpose for water baptism? As discussed shortly in Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus, we are all 'born physically from a mother's womb'. The language Jesus uses is 'born of water' (as in 'a woman's water breaking') to convey a certain universal birthright to receive salvation, aside from being affiliated with any religious group. In Jesus' day, that group was of course Judaism, but in today's world, many other religions, namely Catholicism, think that 'salvation is a birthright exclusive to them'; or to anyone who bows to their false god, and thus becomes 'reborn into their religion'. And so, to try and convey that **salvation** was **not** exclusive to Jews alone, but **universally** to all of humanity, Jesus used 'the universal and essential substance for life on earth': Water. We are all 'born of water', and 'sustain life by water'. Water is what we all have in common, and so **Water** guite simply symbolizes the **equality** of all humans. Therefore, the *true, original* purpose of performing water baptism was only 'to Symbolize the simple knowledge that we are all already born equally of water from a mother's womb'. And this of course makes the true, underlying purpose of water baptism to '<u>create **equality**</u> which ultimately <u>produces freedom</u>, <u>unity</u>, <u>and peace</u>, while simultaneously <u>destroying</u> the supremacy that is inherited through ancestral sin'. I.e., Christ's knowledge of universal equality (which is merely *symbolized* by water baptism) absorbed into our minds, is the <u>only cure</u> for <u>ancestral</u> sin; the *outward* sprinkling of water will do nothing for the *inward* disease of ancestral sin. Today we have skewed the meaning of the word 'baptism' to be associated with the specific outward ritual that is performed when someone is born, but in Jesus' day the word 'baptism' was used to mean 'any initiation, test, or introduction to a new teaching, mindset, or knowledge'. So to be 'baptized with water' meant, or Symbolized that, 'you were introduced to Jesus' new teaching or knowledge of the equality of all humans, which is based on the simplest concept that we are all born from a mother's womb of the universal substance, <u>water</u>'; which in Jesus' day meant that <u>both Jews and Gentiles</u> were **equal**, regardless of **circumcision** and any other of the 'dead works of the Jewish law' that promoted *boasting* and *supremacy*. Note that, if you do not think this idea is just as <u>new</u> and <u>radical</u> today, as it was 2000 years ago, then consider telling any deeply religious person that, regardless of their religious practices, they are on 'an equal plane in terms of salvation' to any Atheist, Muslim, Jew, Catholic, Buddhist, etc. This idea goes against why most people belong to a religion in the first place: because they think that through their religion they are on a higher, superior plane than someone of another religion, or someone of <u>no</u> religion (i.e., Atheists). And so true water baptism *introduced* people to this <u>revolutionary</u> new idea of equality that functioned independently of any religious deeds or works; realizing here that Catholicism's (or any religion's) water baptism is a 'dead work of the Catholic law' that - just as circumcision did 2000 years ago - promotes supremacy (i.e., 'no salvation without Catholic baptism'), and is therefore in **direct opposition** to 'the knowledge of equality behind true water baptism'... essentially making 'Catholicism's baptism' = 'an anti-baptism'. Thus, we must recognize that the water baptism we have inherited (as ancestral sin disguised as 'a time honored tradition') from our Catholic ancestors is not true water baptism, and is simply a modern

day equivalent to circumcision, which, as Paul pointed out on numerous occasions, was a 'dead work of the Jewish Law' that obscured and opposed 'the knowledge of righteousness' that was supposed to be represented by circumcision. And, since true water baptism's true purpose was, and still is, 'to remove the ancestral sin of supremacy by merely symbolizing the new teaching that we are all born equal of water', the true purpose of true water baptism is (ironically) 'to destroy what we now recognize as the supremacy of Catholic/Christian water baptism'. Remember, Satan deceives by confusing us with names and words. Just because we call something in today's world by 'the same name as was used in the Bible', it does not mean that they are the same thing. The water baptism that our world is familiar with is 'the exact opposite of true water baptism' (i.e., it is an anti-baptism), and we don't even realize it because Satan (just as he calls himself 'Jesus') calls it 'water baptism in the name of Christ'; i.e., we must realize that 'the water baptism we have inherited from the Forefathers of Catholicism' is 'water baptism in the name of Satan'.

To show that the definition and intention of <u>baptism</u> has been <u>skewed</u> (by Satan and Catholic tradition, of course) to mean 'the <u>specific ritual</u> that is performed as a <u>dead work</u> of our religious laws', examine the <u>following verses</u> that use the word '<u>baptism</u>' to mean 'any initiation, test, or introduction to a new teaching, mindset, or <u>knowledge</u>'. These verses all use the word '<u>baptism</u>', yet underscore the importance of 'the <u>knowledge behind</u> the baptism'; of course thereby helping us to see that 'it is the <u>knowledge of equality behind water baptism</u> - as this <u>knowledge</u> is the <u>only cure</u> for ancestral sin-that is essential for salvation', <u>not</u> the actual '<u>outward act or deed of water baptism</u>'. Or as Paul would say, 'It is circumcision or <u>baptism of the heart</u> that justifies a man before God, <u>not</u> the <u>outward act</u> of circumcision or baptism'.

1. In 1 Corinthians 10.1-2 Paul says "All (of our forefathers) were baptized into Moses". Here baptism meant that the Israelites were introduced to 'what' was once the new teaching of the 10 Commandments. Thus they were 'baptized into' or introduced to the new teaching (i.e., new knowledge) of the 10 Commandments. With this baptism there was also an implied test of strength and endurance, and maybe even death. We can easily assume that 'the 40 years the Israelites spent wandering in the desert' was part of their test or baptism. So being 'baptized into Moses' was both 'a physical test of endurance' and 'an introduction to a new teaching'.

Consider if Moses had sprinkled desert sand on the Israelites, and then proclaimed 'You are baptized in the name of the God who brought you up out of the land of Egypt', yet none of the Israelites followed the 10 Commandments; obviously then 'the sprinkling with desert sand' and 'the accompanying incantation' would be worthless. Therefore, we can easily see by this example that 'the knowledge of the 10 Commandments behind this baptism is what is important', and obviously any 'sprinkling with desert sand' is totally unimportant and purely symbolic of 'being introduced to the new teaching or knowledge of the 10 Commandments'.

2. In Luke 12.50 Jesus foreshadows His <u>death</u> on the cross by saying "<u>I have a **baptism** to be baptized with, and how distressed I am till it is accomplished!</u>" This '<u>baptism on the cross'</u>, which implies death and the shedding of Christ's blood, is obviously not even remotely close to the water baptism that most people are familiar with, in which, at the very worst, someone must immerse themselves in a pool of cool water. And so Jesus uses the term <u>baptism</u>, in this sense, as 'a <u>test</u> of endurance', through which comes the <u>sealing and initiation</u> of the <u>New Covenant</u>; which is in itself a statement of <u>universal equality</u> (see the '<u>equality clause</u>' in Section 2), articulating the <u>knowledge</u> that 'Everyone from the <u>least</u> to the <u>greatest</u> shall <u>all</u> know God equally and the same'. So, we must recognize that, by obscuring and rejecting the <u>knowledge</u> of the New Covenant, we also obscure and reject the <u>knowledge</u> behind 'Christ's baptism on the cross'. And, while the act of 'Christ's baptism on the cross' is not to be understated, we make it meaningless and 'for nothing' by practicing supremacy in Christ's name (referring to the supremacy Catholic water baptism). Thus, it is the <u>underlying knowledge</u> of equality behind 'Christ's baptism on the cross' that is of most importance.

3. In Mark 11.30 Jesus says "The **baptism** of John - was it from **heaven** or from **men**?" Here

Jesus is stating that, for John the Baptist to be a true Prophet, his baptism had to come from heaven, not men (noting that a priest's ordination is a 'baptism from men'). John's 'baptism from heaven' gave him the authority to speak on God's behalf; something that cannot be given by men. 'Baptism from heaven' is what Jesus is summarizing in Matthew 5.3-12 and Luke 6.20-23. Many religious leaders don't realize it (because they are not true Prophets), but what we call 'the Beatitudes', is actually Jesus' description of a true Prophet's 'baptism from heaven'. 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, blessed are those who mourn, blessed are those who hunger for righteousness, blessed are the peacemakers, and blessed are the persecuted. This is how it was for the prophets before you.' No wonder Jeremiah (a true Prophet) was called 'the Weeping Prophet'. God made Jeremiah 'see what He saw', 'hear what He heard', and 'feel what He felt'. As you can imagine, God sees, hears, and feels a lot of pain, oppression, injustice, and lies. This 'baptism from heaven' would crush any man's spirit, and make any man 'mourn'. But a true Prophet must see, hear, and feel 'what God sees, hears, and feels' in order to be a true 'peacemaker'. Therefore, while both represent the imparting of knowledge, 'John's baptism from heaven' as opposed to 'John baptizing others with water', are two totally different **baptisms**. Water baptism only implies 'being told knowledge', yet 'John's baptism from heaven' (a sort of 'baptism of the Holy Spirit', which is also being 'born of the Spirit') gave him the knowledge and authority to be 'the one who tells others the knowledge associated with water baptism'. So 'John's baptism from heaven' was his initiation as a true Prophet and true teacher of God. By this initiation - some sort of 'hard, mournful **testing** period' - God introduced John to a new way of thinking (i.e., **new knowledge**). That is, 'John's baptism from heaven' was 'a revealing of the knowledge of the one true God' by making him 'poor in spirit and mournful'. And as John's baptism was a 'test of endurance' (just like Jesus' baptism on the cross) that is not to be understated, the **knowledge** that John acquired as a result of his baptism from heaven is 'what was ultimately of importance'. In other words, someone could physically go through the

same 'test of endurance' that John or Jesus went through, yet <u>not</u> have the same knowledge because the test or initiation was <u>set up and conducted</u> (as is a priest's ordination) by <u>men</u>, <u>not</u> <u>God</u>. Note that this is easily understood by considering that 'the <u>2 men</u> who were <u>crucified</u> on either side of Jesus' went through basically 'the <u>same</u> physical test of endurance that Jesus endured', yet obviously did not have the same knowledge as Jesus. Therefore, again, it is <u>the</u> **knowledge** behind 'John's **baptism** from heaven' that is important.

4. In John 1.31&33 John the Baptist says "I did not know who He (Jesus) would be, but I came baptizing with water in order to make Him known to the people of Israel. (It) is He (Jesus) who <u>baptizes</u> with the <u>Holy Spirit</u>". In Luke 3.16 "John (the Baptist) answered saying to all 'I indeed <u>baptize</u> you with <u>water</u>, but One mightier than I will <u>baptize</u> you with the <u>Holy Spirit and fire</u>"''. Here John the Baptist himself tells us directly - noting he does not say 'I came baptizing with water to remove original sin' - that 'his baptizing others with water was only to signify and foretell of Jesus' arrival'. I.e., the water, in essence, symbolized Jesus Himself (the Fountain of living water) as the One who would bring about peace and unity through the knowledge that 'we are all born of water', and are therefore equal. John, implying the insignificance of the act of water baptism, is also conveying that the more important baptism is 'baptism of the Holy Spirit' (or being 'born of the Spirit'), which is the effect of 'truly believing and **conceding to** Jesus' words of equality which are based on everyone being born equal of water'. Thus, 'baptizing others with water' was only meant to symbolize 'Jesus Himself and His new teaching (i.e., **new knowledge**) of equality' that, if **believed**, would bring about 'baptism of the Holy Spirit'; remembering from Section 7 that 'Jesus' words are dead without belief' just as 'the flesh is dead without blood'.

As you can see from these previous quotes, 'baptism' was a term used for a variety of 'initiations, tests, and introductions to new teachings and mindsets' that all emphasized knowledge (and true belief in your heart) **over** any one <u>physical</u>, <u>Outward act or deed</u>. And so we must recognize that, <u>if we don't</u> know the **knowledge behind water baptism**, mindlessly performing it as 'an act of **normalized** (by the name of Christ) sorcery', then we run the risk of being tricked by Satan, initiated into 'Satan's false doctrine' that disguises itself as 'Christ's true doctrine'... which is exactly what has happened for the last 2000 years. In other words, 'the knowledge behind water baptism' is that 'we are all born equally of water', yet by using Catholic/Christian water baptism (just as the Jews used circumcision) as 'a means of <u>excluding</u> others from salvation, thereby developing a <u>supreme mindset</u>', we have been tricked by Satan into performing an 'anti-baptism' (or 'opposite baptism') that (confusingly) goes by the name 'baptism', thereby blindly becoming disciples of Satan while thinking that we are disciples of Christ; remembering that 'names are utterly deceiving', and Satan uses names to COnfuse and trick us. And in terms of 'names being confusing', we must again recognize here that, since A) Catholic/Christian water baptism (an 'act or deed of the Catholic law') promotes the same ancestral sin of supremacy that Jewish circumcision promoted in Jesus' day, and since **B)** true water baptism was performed to ultimately **impart** 'the **knowledge** of universal **equality**' that **eliminated** this **ancestral sin** of **supremacy**,

then (ironically) true water baptism was Originally performed to destroy and eliminate the same type of ancestral sin of supremacy that is, and has been for nearly 2000 years, propagated by Catholic/Christian water baptism. So we should know that it is 'the inward knowledge of equality behind (or symbolized by) water baptism' - not 'the outward act of pouring water on someone and saying a spiritual spell' - that it is **essential** for **salvation**, as this knowledge opposes the **supremacy** (taught by religions) that leads to eternal damnation. In Jesus' day, this meant that 'Jews and Gentiles were equal, regardless of religious affiliation'. Likewise, in today's world, this means that '<u>Jews</u>, Catholics, Protestants, Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists, Atheists, etc. are equal, regardless of religious affiliation'. So we should understand that, if under the blind guidance of Catholicism, we have (for nearly 2000 years) used baptism (just as the Jews used circumcision) to create separatism, exclusivity, and **supremacy** - the precursors to 'division, war, and hate' - then the baptism of Catholicism, and every other religion that has trickled down from Catholicism, directly opposes and contradicts the very essence of Christ's intentions for water baptism, making them all 'anti-baptisms' that propagate ancestral sin. Furthermore, by having people 'baptized into a religion' (i.e., a false god), we must recognize that people are being trained to 'unknowingly swear an allegiance, or an oath, to a false god'. This is why Jesus says in Matthew 5.34 'Do not swear any oaths', as Satan uses 'oaths supposedly sworn to God' to make people unknowingly 'swear oaths to him and any of his false gods (i.e., our religions)'. Again, this makes it obvious why 'any and all water baptisms that we have inherited from Catholicism' are in fact 'anti-baptisms of the Antichrist': baptisms that teach people to swear 'oaths of supremacy', thereby <u>directly opposing</u> the **original intention** of 'the <u>true</u> water baptisms performed by Jesus' Apostles'. That is, true water baptism (with knowledge superseding any physical act) is simply 'having been told the knowledge that every human is equal in terms of potentially receiving salvation, regardless of their religion', and the Catholic/Christian water baptisms that we have inherited teach supremacy and exclusion (i.e., 'no salvation without water baptism'), thereby making them antibaptisms that propagate Catholic/Christian ancestral sin (i.e., macro level supremacy and exclusion).

Now, in order to recognize 'the true symbolic meaning and knowledge behind water baptism' - i.e., water baptism is purely symbolic of 'the equality of all humans, all being born of water from a mother's womb' - let's examine 'the language of the day' in Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus the Pharisee to see the relationship between 'born of water' and 'baptized with water'; remembering while examining this passage that the main idea of A) The Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard, B) The Parable of the Prodigal Son, C) the New Covenant itself, and D) the Golden Rule (i.e., 'Do unto others as you would have them do unto you') is quite simply equality.

In <u>John 3.3-6</u> Jesus says to Nicodemus "Most assuredly, I say to you, unless one is <u>born again</u>, he cannot see the kingdom of God". Then Nicodemus says to Jesus "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter a <u>second time</u> into his <u>mother's womb</u> and <u>be born</u>?" Jesus answered "Most assuredly, I say to you, <u>unless one is born of water</u> and the **Spirit**, he cannot enter

<u>the kingdom of God</u>. That which is <u>born of the flesh</u> is flesh, and that which is <u>born of the Spirit</u> is spirit."

First off, the <u>Catholic translation</u> of this passage says 'born again of water and the Spirit' (adding the word 'again') in order to <u>assert</u> (in their catechism or doctrine) that 'born again of water' means 'Catholic water baptism', which thereby <u>also</u> <u>asserts</u> (for their <u>own glory</u>) that 'Jesus was <u>insisting</u> on everyone being baptized with water into the Catholic faith'. But we must recognize that this assertion, in context, does not make any sense. Remember, Satan keeps his lies close to the truth. So while 'water baptism is <u>Symbolic</u> of <u>Al literally</u> being born of water from a <u>mother's womb</u> (as in a <u>woman's water breaking</u>), and <u>Bl</u> the <u>universal equality</u> that this represents', to use 'water baptism' and 'born of water' interchangeably is incorrect. Yet, Catholicism once again has insisted that 'these two terms are the <u>same</u> and interchangeable' in order to glorify themselves and enslave the multitudes, saying 'Jesus said in John 3.5 that you must bow to us men and receive our Catholic water baptism, or else you will go to hell'. Hence, if we simply look at the <u>context</u> of John 3.5 - "Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God" - it becomes obvious that:

born of water = our 1st physical birth and born of the Spirit = our 2nd spiritual birth

Now this of course means that 'born <u>again</u>' in John 3.3 is <u>simply</u> referring to 'our <u>2nd</u> spiritual birth', and <u>if</u> the word 'again' was added to John 3.5 in the Catholic translation of the Bible, then it <u>must</u> have been referring to 'our 2nd spiritual birth' in order to make any sense in context; realizing that, even if a <u>comma</u> was omitted from the punctuation, then Catholicism's translation would essentially read as 'Unless one is born again' of water and (<u>then again</u>) of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God'. Therefore, if we simply examine <u>each line</u> on <u>either side</u> of John 3.5, then it in fact becomes obvious that 'born again' is referring <u>only</u> to 'our <u>2nd</u> spiritual birth', and 'born of water' is simply referring to 'our <u>1st</u> physical birth'; which <u>every human being</u> on the planet has obviously already taken part in, pointing to our <u>equality</u>, and that <u>everyone has already satisfied</u> (i.e., everyone is included) the <u>1st</u> 'requirement' for 'entering the kingdom of God' by just being physically born... again <u>nullifying</u> any assertion by Catholicism (or any other religion) that 'The 1st requirement (as per John 3.5 or any other misinterpreted Bible quote) for entering the kingdom of God is our Catholic water baptism'. It should therefore be noted that, after examining John 3.4, <u>5</u>, & <u>6</u>, it will become apparent that these <u>3</u> consecutive verses are in fact using <u>3 different terms</u> which <u>all</u> = 'being born <u>physically</u> or <u>naturally</u> from a mother's womb'. And so the context verses on either side of John 3.5 say:

- A) John 3.4: "Can (a man) enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born?"
- B) John 3.6: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."

Now 'B' is somewhat <u>harder</u> to understand. And so that it makes more sense with 'A' in terms of 'being born from a mother's womb', John 3.6 (or 'B') would translate as:

B) <u>John 3.6 (translated)</u>: 'A man that is <u>born of a mother's womb</u> is born <u>physically</u>, and a man that is born of the Spirit's womb is born spiritually.'

This makes it clear that <u>both</u> John 3.4 and John 3.6 are speaking about 'a <u>physical birth from a mother's womb</u>'. And now if we recap the <u>dialogue sequence</u> it will become clear that '<u>born of water in John 3.5'</u> <u>also</u> = 'our 1st <u>physical or natural birth from a mother's womb</u>' (i.e., born of water does <u>not</u> = water baptism), with John 3.4 & 6 (the verses <u>immediately</u> before and <u>after John 3.5</u>) supporting this, and showing that these are in fact 3 <u>consecutive verses</u>, all using <u>different terms</u> to mean <u>the same exact</u> thing.

- 1. <u>John 3.4</u>: Nicodemus (after being told that he must be <u>born</u> a <u>second time</u>) essentially asks Jesus 'With a man's <u>1st birth</u>, he is <u>born physically</u> of a <u>mother's womb</u>, so will a man's <u>2nd birth</u> <u>also</u> be from a <u>mother's womb</u>?'
- 2. <u>John 3.5</u>: Jesus replies to Nicodemus, 'A man must be <u>born of water</u> and <u>born of the **Spirit**</u> to enter the kingdom of God.'
- 3. <u>John 3.6</u>: Jesus then <u>clarifies</u> John 3.5 by saying 'A man that is <u>born of a mother's womb</u> is born <u>physically</u>, and a man that is <u>born of the Spirit's womb</u> is born <u>spiritually</u>.'

Thus, after breaking down this dialogue sequence and realizing the <u>context</u> that it is in, we can <u>rewrite</u> <u>John 3.5</u> to show that it, and John 3.4 & 6, are in fact 3 <u>consecutive verses</u> that are <u>all</u> referencing 'a physical birth from a mother's womb being our 1st birth', with 'being <u>born of water'</u> being <u>simply</u> another way of referring to this '1st physical birth' (remembering that 'our 1st physical birth from a mother's womb' involves 'a <u>woman's water breaking</u>' thereby being 'born a <u>water</u>').

<u>John 3.5 (translated)</u>: 'Most assuredly, I say to you, unless a man is <u>born of a mother's womb</u> and then is <u>born again</u> (i.e., a <u>second</u> time) <u>of the **Spirit's womb**</u>, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.'

This ultimately means, in equation format, that:

born of *a mother's womb*

=

born of water

=

born of the flesh

Recall here that in Section 7 'physical bread kept the Israelites physically alive in the desert, yet spiritual bread (i.e., Jesus' words) would keep someone spiritually alive'. So realizing that on many occasions

Jesus used physical terms to parallel the spiritual world, using 'tangible, familiar, and

understandable language' to figuratively explain (as no one actually enters 'a Spirit's womb that looks like an **oversized** woman's womb') 'the intangible, unfamiliar, and incomprehensible spiritual world', it is more than obvious (after breaking down this dialogue sequence to see that in fact 3 consecutive different terms are actually equivalents) that Jesus was in fact doing the same here (i.e., John 3.586). That is, <u>Jesus was quite simply paralleling</u> 'a spiritual birth' to 'a physical birth' to try and explain this concept to Nicodemus in 'tanqible, physical terms that he was already familiar with and could understand'; just as the Jews of Jesus' day were already familiar with A) 'the Israelites eating physical bread to stay alive physically', and B) 'physically eating the flesh of a Passover lamb to stay alive physically', both of which were used by Jesus to draw figurative parallels to 'what is spiritual and intangible' (again, see Section 7), thereby making them easier to explain. Think about it. If you were trying to convey 'another kind of birth Other than your 1st natural birth', would you not also be talking about 'a person's 1st birth' in order to draw parallels that help you describe this 'new type of birth that is in the unseen, intangible world'? So we must realize that, while water baptism is symbolic of 'being born equal of water', it also quite simply just symbolizes 'our 1st physical birth' in order to draw a parallel to, and more easily describe 'our 2nd spiritual birth' or 'rebirth'; remembering that the purpose of this clarification (i.e., that 'born of water' does not equal 'baptized with water') is to disprove Catholicism's assertion that 'Jesus in saying in John 3.5 that we must be baptized with water in order to be saved'. This is further reiterated by realizing that, if we can all at least concede that **Nicodemus** (not Jesus) was in fact speaking about 'a 1st birth being from a mother's womb', with Jesus (just before this) saying 'You must be born a 2nd time, or again', it does not make any sense that 'this 2nd time would be born of water', as this would then imply 'a 3rd birth of the Spirit' as if Jesus said 'You must be born again of water, and then born a 3rd time of the Spirit'; which is obviously never mentioned ... although Catholicism here has double mindedly combined 'born of water and born of the Spirit' into 'one birth' in order to 'jive with Scripture' (i.e., they say 'baptized with water + baptized with the Holy Spirit' = 'one singular rebirth'), yet at the same time, they themselves separate 'baptism and <u>Confirmation</u>', again <u>implying</u> a <u>3rd birth</u> that is <u>never mentioned</u> (as it does <u>not</u> exist). Additionally it should be noted that, in John 3.8, Jesus says "The wind blows where it wishes, and you hear the sound of it, but cannot tell where it comes from and where it goes. So is everyone who is born of the Spirit"; which, by **not** saying 'So is everyone who is <u>born of water and</u> the **Spirit**' (Omitting 'born of water' and not combining it with 'born of the Spirit'), again proves that 'born of water' is only referring to 'our 1st physical birth' and not our 'rebirth'. In other words, 'born of the Spirit' = 'being born again', whereas 'born of water' is not 'being born again', but rather just 'being physically born the 1st time'. So while it is fair to say that 'born of the Spirit' and 'baptized by the Holy Spirit' may be used interchangeably - as they are in terms of something 'non-tangible in the unseen realm, and therefore indistinguishable' - we must realize that 'born of water' and 'baptized with water' (being tangible occurrences in the physical, <u>seen</u> realm, and thereby <u>distinguishable</u> from one another) are <u>not</u> interchangeable terms, yet related, as 'water baptism' quite simply is Symbolic of A) 'our 1st physical birth' in general, and B) the knowledge surrounding 'our 1st physical birth' that 'we are all born

<u>of water</u> from a mother's womb, and are <u>all</u> therefore <u>equal'</u>; ultimately understanding that <u>both</u> terms (i.e., 'born of water' and 'baptized with water') are being used to draw <u>parallels</u> to 'our 2nd birth', where we are 'born again of the Spirit'.

Now it is important to recognize - as water baptism is not essential for salvation - 'what is essential for salvation and entering the kingdom of God'; that is, 'what is it' that brings about 'our 2nd birth of the **Spirit**'. As already mentioned, it is **'belief** in or **conceding** to this **knowledge** of **equality** that a person is **initiated** or **baptized** into' that leads to 'being born of the Spirit' or 'being baptized by the Holy Spirit'... which then leads to salvation (i.e., eternal life, 'entering the kingdom of God', etc.). As Mark 16.15-16 says 'He who **believes** (and concedes to) the gospel of equality will be **baptized** by the Holy Spirit (i.e., born of the Spirit) and <u>saved</u>, but he who does **not** believe will be <u>condemned</u>'; which corresponds to John 3.36. Now we must realize that this of course is simply another *restatement* of Jesus' recurring theme: 'Whoever hears My words (i.e., is <u>baptized</u> in My <u>words</u>) and **believes**, <u>receives</u> the <u>Holy Spirit</u> (i.e., is 'born again of the Spirit') and has eternal life' (John 5.24 and John 6.54), remembering that these are mentioned and explained in Section 7, with the understanding that 'believing' and 'receiving the Holy Spirit' are always 'paired' together. As John 7.39 says, 'Those believing in Jesus would receive the Holy Spirit'. Also note that, with Catholicism (for their own glory) placing so much emphasis on 'the supposed outward act of water baptism in John 3.5', we almost overlook that Jesus tells us (with sheer <u>repetition</u>) in this passage with Nicodemus '<u>what</u> the <u>most important part of His message is</u>', telling Nicodemus 4 different times after John 3.5 (see verses 12, 15, 16, & 18) that 'belief is the most important thing'; remembering that it is 'belief in (i.e., truly understanding and conceding in your heart to) Christ's words or message of equality' that is the main idea of 'The Parable of the Sower' (Matthew 13.3-9), not letting Christ's words 'fall by the wayside and be choked out within us'. And so it is 'inward belief' that is of most importance, not 'outward acts of normalized sorcery such as Catholic/Christian water baptism', knowing that it is 'belief' alone that leads to 'being born again of the Spirit' and salvation. As it says in Acts 11.14-17, 'Peter introduced (i.e., baptized) the Gentiles to Christ's **words** of equality **by which** they would be **saved**. And when the Gentiles **believed**, they were <u>baptized with the **Holy Spirit**</u> (i.e., born of the Spirit).' Likewise in **Acts 15.7-8**, Peter says 'When the Gentiles heard the word of the gospel and believed, God gave them the Holy Spirit just as He did to us'. And as 1 Peter 1.22&23 says 'You have been born again of the Spirit by obeying (i.e., believing) the word of God'; noticing that Peter does not say 'You have been born again of the Spirit by being baptized with water', but rather by 'hearing the word of God (which is in essence being baptized with water) and believing the word of God'. And that word is the knowledge that 'we (whether Jew, Catholic, **Protestant, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, Atheist, etc.**) are all born of water from a mother's womb, and are <u>all</u> therefore <u>universally equal</u>' (noting that this is 'the <u>universal</u> nature of Christ's church, temple, or body', making 'the Catholic Church' 'a false universal church'), with water baptism being purely symbolic of this knowledge, and simply meant to represent an initiation or introduction to this **knowledge**, having supreme importance thereby placed on 'the underlying knowledge behind the

<u>water baptism itself'</u> (remembering here the <u>4</u> previous quotes using the word 'baptism'), as this 'knowledge of equality' is what leads to (by <u>leaving behind</u> our <u>ancestral sin</u> based in the <u>supremacist</u> traditions of our forefathers, essentially being '<u>separated</u> from our <u>mother's figurative womb'</u>) 'our <u>2nd</u> birth', being '<u>born of the Spirit'</u>; noting here that this 'baptism of the Holy Spirit' also implies some sort of <u>test</u>, of course set up and conducted only by **God** (not men).

To reiterate, 'the actual physical act (i.e., the deed) of water baptism' is purely symbolic of 'the knowledge that we are all born equal of water'. I.e., water baptism is an outward physical sign that represents the inward knowledge of 'the universal equality of humanity'. And it is this inward knowledge (which the New Covenant says is 'written on our hearts' already) that is essential for <u>salvation</u>, not any <u>outward</u> *physical sign*. Therefore, to use water baptism as 'an **outward** physical sign of **supremacy**' actually makes 'the **inward knowledge** of **equality** that **true** water baptism represents' **null** and **void**. So we should recognize that Catholicism, **defiling** the knowledge **behind** water baptism, has done just as Judaism did with circumcision - i.e., Catholic (or any Christian) water baptism is the modern day equivalent of circumcision - turning water baptism into a 'deed of the Catholic law' (or well disguised act of sorcery) by which they erroneously think God will justify Catholics only, excluding others from salvation. Paul, in Romans 2.25-29, was trying to convey this idea - that 'salvation had nothing to do with the outward ritual of circumcision' - by saying that 'A Gentile (someone not outwardly circumcised) was already inwardly circumcised if he simply acted righteously'. This is further reiterated in Colossians 2.11 by Paul saying that 'By Christ's teaching or knowledge you are circumcised with the <u>circumcision made</u> Without human hands'; i.e., an <u>inward</u> 'circumcision of the heart'. To understand the gravity of this, consider a devout Christian being told that 'an Atheist (i.e., someone not believing in God, yet righteous) was <u>in essence already baptized</u> (both of water and the Spirit) if they truly believed in the knowledge of universal equality'. So because Paul recognized that water baptism was an outward physical sign (like circumcision) which was unnecessary for salvation, and even thanking God that he did not baptize certain people in 1 Corinthians 1.14 - Paul says in 1 Corinthians 1.17 "Christ did not send me to baptize. He sent me to tell the Good News"; of course understanding that 'telling the true Good News' was 'baptizing people in, or introducing them to, Christ's words and knowledge of universal equality among Jews and Gentiles' so that all the people who 'heard this knowledge' were in essence 'baptized with water', Without actually having any 'outward act involving water' take place. Furthermore, as Jesus Himself of course knew that outward baptism could not affect anything inward, John 4.2 says "Jesus Himself did not baptize anyone". Therefore, it is obvious that both Jesus and Paul understood and taught that it was Christ's inward knowledge (i.e., the words of Christ) which would make someone's heart clean (see John 15.3). The outward ritual of baptism is only Symbolic of this inward knowledge, and, just as the ritual of circumcision, the outward ritual of baptism can (and has been) used by Satan to defeat the whole purpose of water baptism, turning it into an Outward symbol of supremacy and exclusion. Thus, we must realize that this was the whole reason why the true Good News of the New Covenant called for an end

to the 'dead works of the law' 2000 years ago: the <u>outward rituals</u> (or 'deeds of the Jewish law') were actually <u>opposing</u> and <u>defiling</u> 'the <u>knowledge</u> that the rituals (or deeds) were <u>supposed to represent</u>'. And so is the case with Catholicism's (or anyone else's) ritual of water baptism. <u>Water baptism has been used for nearly 2000 years as an outward symbol of supremacy</u> and <u>exclusiveness</u> to <u>salvation</u>, thereby opposing and <u>defiling</u> the <u>inward knowledge of equality</u> that 'the <u>original</u> act of water baptism performed by the Apostles' was <u>supposed to</u> represent. Remember, Jesus <u>never</u> baptized anyone because it is 'the true knowledge <u>behind</u> water baptism' that matters. And, to treat the <u>outward ritual</u> of water baptism as if it affects a person's <u>inward soul</u>, is to cross the line into '<u>normalized sorcery</u>' and 'spiritually charged water'.

So we must ultimately realize that it is **not** the **outward** act of water baptism that is **essential** for salvation, but rather 'the <u>inward</u> understanding and <u>true belief</u> in the knowledge of universal **equality** and inclusion' (of course based on all of humanity being 'born universally of water') that is essential for salvation. That is, it is 'inward water baptism of the **heart'** (i.e., **hearing** and **believing** the knowledge of equality and inclusion) which is essential for salvation, just as Paul conveyed that it is 'inward circumcision of the **heart'** (Romans 2.29) - not **outward** physical circumcision - that is essential for salvation and justification before God; realizing of course that outward physical circumcision or water baptism (by producing supremacy, exclusion, and boasting) actually opposes inward 'circumcision or water baptism of the <u>heart</u>', and the idea of <u>universal equality</u> and <u>inclusion</u> where "<u>There is</u> neither Greek nor Jew, circumcised nor uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave nor free, but Christ is <u>all and in all (equally)</u>" (Colossians 3.11). Think about it. Would Paul not be **double minded if** he were to insist that 'outward circumcision is not essential for salvation', then turn around and insist that 'outward water baptism iS essential for salvation'? Remember, Paul himself said 'I did not come to baptize' (1 Corinthians 1.17), knowing baptism is purely symbolic of 'Christ's knowledge of universal equality and inclusion' (i.e., the Good News). So again, it is 'inward baptism of the heart' (i.e., hearing and **believing** the knowledge of **equality** and **inclusion**) that **is essential** for **salvation** (as this is how people are truly 'baptized by the Holy Spirit'), and the outward water baptism of our religions (namely Catholicism) is the cause of *supremacy* and *boasting* - just like circumcision - which actually **hinders** our salvation.

Now that it is established that 'belief in Christ's knowledge of equality' is the **only way** to be 'born again of the Holy Spirit' or 'baptized with the Holy Spirit', we must recognize that the Catholic hierarchy has made the outrageous claim that they, mere men, have the ability - by 'performing an outward ritual (or 'deed of the Catholic law') and saying a few choice spiritual incantations' - to 'impart to others the Holy Spirit', knowing that is impossible for them to truly know if someone (who is usually too young anyway) 'believes' or 'does not believe' (assuming that they even know 'what to believe in', which they do not if they were raised into Catholicism). In other words, the 'imparting the Holy Spirit to others' (i.e., 'baptizing others with the Holy Spirit') is 'what the Catholic hierarchy asserts they have the

power to do' in the Sacrament of Confirmation, saying (erroneously) that their 'ordination into the priesthood' is essentially a 'baptism from heaven' that grants them the authority (as supposed descendants of Peter and the Apostles) to 'impart to others the Holy Spirit'. But the Catholic hierarchy's 'ordination into the priesthood' is **not** a 'baptism from heaven', but a 'baptism from men' - i.e., they chose themselves, they were not chosen by God - that perpetuates the man-made false god 'Catholicism', and subsequently their man-made authority and glory. The simple fact is that 'Catholicism's supposed authority to impart the Holy Spirit to others' is a false authority granted to them by Satan, and an authority that has been made-up and fabricated in the name of Peter. In Acts, Peter himself realizes how **God gives** the Holy Spirit to anyone He wishes. That is, Peter professes that 'he neither grants nor impedes the receiving of the Holy Spirit'. Acts 11.16-17 says "Then I (Peter) remembered what the Lord had said: 'John baptized with water, but you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit'. If therefore **God gave** those Gentiles the **same** gift as He gave us when we **believed** in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I to try to stop God!" Notice that Jesus told the Apostles "You will be baptized with the Holy Spirit". Jesus **never** told the Apostles that 'they would baptize with the Holy Spirit' (see Acts 1.5); that is reserved for God, and God alone (see Acts 15.8 where 'God alone knows the heart'), making it obvious why 'receiving the Holy Spirit' or 'baptism of the Holy Spirit' is called 'baptism from heaven' (see Mark 11.30), and not 'baptism from men'. As Peter says, "God gave" not 'I gave' (see also Acts 15.8). Thus, we must realize that 'the Holy Spirit is imparted by God alone, who knows the heart, and whether or not people truly believe'; the Holy Spirit is not imparted by any man or man-made principality such as Catholicism. And if anything, Peter - the name that Catholicism calls upon (i.e., speaks lies behind) to support their claim that 'they have the power to impart the Holy Spirit' - says that he has the **same** Holy Spirit that was given to the **Gentiles**, thereby expressing his spiritual **equality**, not his <u>spiritual supremacy</u>; realizing of course that this means that 'there is <u>not</u>, and <u>never has been</u>, a necessity for the Catholic priesthood in the chain of salvation', as they assert a need for people such as themselves who are supposedly spiritually supreme. Therefore Peter, again asserting his spiritual equality to the Gentiles, says in Acts 15.9 'God made no distinction between us (Jews) and them (Gentiles)'; which by the way also supports the 'equality clause' that is written in the New Covenant: "For <u>all</u> shall know Me (<u>equally</u>), from the <u>least</u> of them, to the <u>greatest</u> of them" (Hebrews 8.11). So again, the Holy Spirit is imparted by God alone, and disseminating the idea that 'men (i.e., the Catholic hierarchy) impart the Holy Spirit to others', only propagates spiritual supremacy, which opposes and contradicts the *spiritual equality* conveyed by Peter himself in the Book of Acts.

It is interesting to note some of the moments when the **Jews** (those of the circumcision) <u>realized</u> their <u>spiritual equality</u> to the **Gentiles** (the uncircumcised), and therefore <u>realized</u> (at least partially) the <u>ancestral sin</u> that they had been born into. Note that this ancestral sin is apparent in **Acts 11.2-3** when Peter is chastised for sitting down to eat with the <u>uncircumcised</u> Gentiles. Here we can see that the Jews obviously thought that *'it was a <u>sin</u> to <u>eat with the Gentiles'</u> (i.e., they were spiritually unclean people), when in actuality it was the Jews who were <u>sinful</u> - and not even knowing it because of <u>inherited</u> <u>ancestral sin</u> - by practicing <u>spiritual supremacy</u> over the Gentiles. The following verses show (at least to some degree) the Jews <u>realizing</u> that <i>'they were <u>no better</u> than the Gentiles'*, and that the attitude of

supremacy they had been **born into** was a **defiled lie** passed down to them from their blind ancestors. A) Acts 11.18 says "When they (the Apostles and other Jewish disciples) heard these things (that Peter spoke) they **became silent** and they glorified God saying 'Then God has also granted to the Gentiles repentance to life". B) Acts 10.45 says "Those of the circumcision were astonished because the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out on the Gentiles also". So we must realize that the Jewish Apostles (like all those of the circumcision) were raised to believe that 'there is no salvation outside of Judaism', just like the Catholic hierarchy believes and teaches that 'there is no salvation outside of Catholicism, or without Catholic/Christian water baptism'. And the idea of 'the Gentiles being spiritually equal to the Jews' was an idea that **opposed** everything they had ever been taught growing up, just as the idea of 'a Catholic and an Atheist being equal in terms of salvation' opposes everything a Catholic (and most other religious people) has ever been taught growing up. The Apostles, just like people raised into Catholicism, inherited an erroneous mindset of supremacy and exclusion from their forefathers (i.e., ancestral sin) that was based on 'deeds of the Jewish law'. And so just like the Jews 2000 years ago, Catholics today have been raised with an inherited erroneous mindset of supremacy and exclusion that is based on 'deeds of the Catholic law', such as Catholic water baptism. Once the Catholic hierarchy gains the true knowledge of Christ (i.e., sight), they will also realize their ancestral sin, 'seeing' that they have actually hindered people's chances of salvation (instead of helped) by instilling a mindset of supremacy and exclusion (i.e., ancestral sin) in their followers with the very act (i.e., Catholic water baptism) that was supposed to represent equality. Thus, the Catholic hierarchy will also 'become silent' and 'be astonished', feeling great shame because of the stiff-necked, proud arrogance and ignorance with which they have blindly taught (as *false* administrators) their people to hate in the name of Christ (that is, 'they have blindly taught ancestral sin'), opposing Christ's simple teaching that 'everyone is born equal of water'.

In Acts 1.8, Jesus' last instructions to the Apostles before being lifted up to heaven was "When the Holy Spirit comes upon you, you will be filled with power and you will be witnesses for Me in Jerusalem, Judea, and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth". A witness is **not** an administrator, and as Peter already said 'God gave the Gentiles the same gift as He gave us, so who was I to stop God'. So again, the Apostles did not administer the Holy Spirit, but instead witnessed God Himself administering the Holy Spirit; meaning of course that 'Catholicism's claim that Peter imparted the Holy Spirit, so therefore they can also impart the Holy Spirit' is a bunk assertion, as Peter only witnessed God imparting the Holy Spirit. Think about it. If 'God gave the Gentiles the same gift as the Apostles', are they not all equal in the sight of God? And if this is true, then are not people from every religion (or non-religion) in today's world <u>just as equal</u> in the sight of God? Therefore we must recognize that <u>Peter</u>, a <u>Jew and an Apostle</u>, was recognizing his **spiritual equality** with 'the common heathen Gentiles'; **not** his **spiritual** supremacy. To understand this concept in today's world, we must consider that this is equivalent to Catholics and Christians (or even Muslims, etc.) admitting that 'Atheists are equal to them in terms of salvation'. But this is a concept that the Catholic hierarchy cannot possibly understand because they were born blind into the lies and darkness of Satan (i.e., ancestral sin) which makes them believe that they are in a place of <u>spiritual supremacy</u> by being A) <u>Catholic</u> and B) a <u>priest</u>. They may <u>love</u> others 'in

word', but the very fact that they pledge their allegiance to the Catholic Church (i.e., their oath to the priesthood of the false god 'Catholicism') is proof that 'they see themselves as first (i.e., supreme) and people of other religions as last (i.e., not worthy of salvation)', and is in fact what propagates their hidden 'message of hate'. In heart, not word, they see themselves as supreme, not equal. Thus, even though the Catholic hierarchy continually chants 'I believe in Jesus', it is really 'Satan that they believe in' by rejecting 'Jesus' words of equality' to follow 'Satan's disguised words of supremacy'. And by teaching their followers this supremacy by pretending to administer and impart 'the gift of the Holy Spirit' in the Sacrament of Confirmation, the Catholic hierarchy, in a hidden and most deceptive way, is really administering and imparting 'the curse of Satan', and (as they are blind leaders) not even knowing it.

It is no small coincidence that America's Declaration of Independence states that 'all men are born equal under one God'. Therefore we must recognize that the United States is part of God's plan of universal equality, as America has 'set the stage' for worldwide equality, peace, and unity. America is **not**, and <u>never has been perfect</u>. But to recognize that 'everyone is born <u>equal</u> in the eyes of God' is about as perfect as it gets in terms of world history, personal liberty, and true freedom. And so we must ultimately realize that God has guided the formation of the United States, essentially founding it on Christ's teaching of universal equality and the New Covenant, which states that 'everyone from the least to the greatest is equal'. <u>True water baptism</u> was meant to <u>teach</u> about the <u>universal</u> equality of the New Covenant so that this equality would bring about unity and peace. But, the Catholic Church has defiled the meaning of water baptism into a proprietary and futile outward act that creates <u>supremacy</u> and exclusion (instead of equality and inclusion) which leads to division and war; noting that this supremacy and exclusion is recited in their <u>creed</u> at every Mass when they say "<u>We believe in one</u>" (Catholic) baptism for the forgiveness of sins". This 'division through supremacy' that the Catholic Church has caused is in direct opposition to the true intention of and knowledge behind water baptism: 'UNITY through EQUALITY'. And so we must realize that, Christians, led of course by Catholicism, have defiled the true meaning of water baptism by taking something that was intended to represent equality and turning it into something that represents supremacy and exclusion. By birth, there was no difference between Jew and Gentile. Yet, the Jews obscured this equality with <u>circumcision</u>, thereby causing senseless **division**. Likewise, **by birth**, as 'everyone is born equal of water', there is no difference between Catholic, Christian, Muslim, Jew, Hindu, Buddhist, or Atheist. But like Judaism 2000 years ago, Christianity has obscured this truth with their proprietary man-made version of water baptism, thereby also causing senseless division. Thus, we can conclude that Christian/Catholic water baptism has been used by Satan as a *symbol* of division, when its true intention was to symbolize unity and the most basic truth that 'we are all of one body'.

Jesus came to unify into one people both Jew and Gentile. He used the common and universal substance of **water** to teach the most **basic** concept that 'we are all standing on the same common ground from birth'. So, if we, in today's world, are to unify people and nations, we must truly **believe** that 'we are all born <u>equal</u> to each other in the eyes of God' and that "God has made from <u>one</u> **blood** every nation of men" (Acts 17.26); i.e., 'we are all born equal of water'. The Jews of Jesus' day, just like the staunch Catholics (or Muslims, Jews, etc.) of today, truly thought that they were born into a certain 'favoritism of God'. They would thank God that they were born into Judaism, instead of being born 'heathen' like the Gentiles. Just like the Catholic Church, the Jewish religion instilled, from the <u>earliest ages of childhood</u>, a certain *supremacy* and *judgment* towards <u>anyone outside</u> their religion and traditions. Thus, we must realize that this idea of 'being God's chosen people' is an idea created by our religious leaders - and passed down to us as ancestral sin - which only creates supremacy and exclusion that ultimately leads to 'division, war, and hate'. We must realize that 'everyone and <u>anyone</u> who simply <u>believes</u> and <u>practices universal equality</u> as <u>one</u> body of people, and <u>opposes</u> sectarianism (i.e., the mob mentality of our religions, or any other supreme, exclusive group), iS considered God's chosen people'. This mentality of equality, which is **symbolized** by water **baptism**, is the only way to **unify** people and nations, and ultimately bring about **world** peace.

14. Man-made Obligations on the Sabbath

In Exodus 20.8-11, the 3rd Commandment says "Remember the <u>Sabbath day</u>, to keep it holy. Six days you shall **labor**, but the **seventh** day **you** (including your **workers** or **laborers**) **shall do no work**. For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth and all that is in them, and **rested** the seventh day. Therefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it". Why does the 3rd Commandment NOT say, 'But on the seventh day you shall gather in the **temple** and perform weekly **sacrifices**, **ceremonies**, and rituals to glorify God? This false interpretation is the Jewish/Catholic interpretation of the 3rd Commandment that we have all inherited. In fact, Catholic doctrine states that 'it is a mortal sin if you neglect to attend Mass on Sunday'; that is, if you neglect your weekly man-made obligation. To explore why Catholicism (and subsequently all of Christianity) in fact opposes Christ by obligating us to attend weekly Mass (or any weekly ceremony), let's recall the true Good News from Section 12. The true Good News is that 'the <u>true worship</u> of God is simply loving others as ourselves' - as '<u>loving others' = 'loving</u> **God'** (see Matthew 25.40&45) - and that 'religion and all of its sacrifices and ceremonies (i.e., 'deeds of religious law') do not supersede this true worship, but rather defile this true worship by leading us to blindly hate others, thereby also blindly hating God'. And as Paul says in Romans 3.20 "By the deeds of the law no flesh will be justified (i.e., saved) in God's sight". This is the true Good News because it is by '<u>deeds</u> and <u>works</u> of religious laws' that people begin to '<u>boast</u> in supremacy (see Ephesians 2.9) that may have a better way of worshiping God than others'. This supremacy, when morphed into mob mentality, in turn breeds dissension and oppression, leading to revolution. I.e., the supremacy and **exclusion** inherent in our religious mobs performing **deeds of the law** ultimately produces **'division**, war, and hate', as is the obvious product of Catholicism's deeds of the law when we look at world history over the last 2000 years. Note that Jesus, referring to the supremacy of the Pharisees and Sadducees (who centered their lives around Jewish deeds of the law), says "Beware of the leaven (i.e., their boasting, or being *puffed up* with pride and supremacy) of the Pharisees and the Sadducees" (Matthew 16.6)... who want their deeds or works of the law to be seen by men (see Matthew 23.5). And as Jesus says in Matthew 9.13, 'God wants deeds of kindness and mercy, not deeds of the law'; inferring of course that 'deeds of the law cause hate and oppression (i.e., the opposite of kindness and mercy) through supremacy and exclusion'. The main point of all of this is that, if we can recognize that Catholicism's Mass, and every other Sunday sacrifice, ceremony, and ritual, is in fact a 'deed of the law in disquise', then we can easily conclude that Catholicism's Mass (and the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, or the Eucharist) is in direct opposition to the true Good News of Christ. Thus, when we read Paul's writings, we must <u>define</u> a Catholic Mass as a 'deed of the law' (falsely instituted in the name of Christ) in order to recognize that, if Paul lived in today's world, he would very much oppose those who practice and perform the Mass and all other *supposed* worship services. And we must recognize above all else that Jesus never instructed us to do anything remotely resembling a Catholic Mass, as this would totally oppose and contradict His true words and true persona, understanding that the idea of the Catholic Mass implies that Jesus double mindedly said 'Though tradition and deeds of the law, God's

Commandments are made null and void (see Mark 7.7-13), yet I want you to start a new tradition and a

new deed of the law in My name'. Therefore, it is obvious that the Catholic hierarchy proudly stands up every week in Mass, *speaking* so confidently about a Person they <u>don't know</u> and have <u>never met</u>, teaching a <u>false persona</u> of Jesus that <u>never existed</u>, and *following* traditions (i.e., the Mass) that Christ never would have instituted.

In addition to Catholicism opposing the true Good News of the New Covenant with their obligation to attend Mass every Sunday - which is rather hidden as they actually use the Good News as their means of mandating people's attendance on Sunday - we must not overlook the Obvious. The Catholic hierarchy insists that their weekly obligation to attend Mass is **based on** the 3rd Commandment, yet (as noted in Exodus 20.8-11) the 3rd Commandment guite simply says nothing about 'attending anything' or 'performing any type of sacrifice, ceremony, or ritual'. The 3rd Commandment only says that 'We should rest on Sunday'; noting that 'keeping the Sabbath holy' means simply 'taking a break from labor', and was intended to ensure that people in charge (i.e., leaders) did not overburden or overwork the laborers. This why Jesus said in Mark 2.27, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath". So how did Catholicism extract from the 3rd Commandment their obligation, under pain of mortal sin, to attend the Mass (their weekly propaganda message)? Like all other Catholic doctrine, they quite simply broke the 2nd Commandment, speaking for Jesus and God as if they are Jesus and God, in order to make an addendum to (that is, 'add on to') the 3rd Commandment; i.e., they fabricated manmade amendments to God's Commandments. So in breaking the 2nd Commandment, Catholicism also breaks the 3rd Commandment, and therefore 'makes the Commandment of God of no effect through their sacred tradition and inherited doctrine, cleverly instituting man's law under the pretense of upholding God's law' (Mark 7.7-13).

Again, if we use our God-given logic and reason, we can easily come to the conclusion that 'Catholicism's obligation, under pain of mortal sin, to attend Mass on Sunday does **not** correspond to the words and persona of Christ'. Think about it. Because Judaism had done just as Catholicism does, breaking the 2nd Commandment in order to 'add on' man-made customs, traditions, doctrine, rituals, etc. to the 3rd Commandment, Christ Himself consequently did not observe the Sabbath. And so because of ancestral sin - i.e., thinking their man-made traditions were from God, while actually being from Satan - the Pharisees thought that Jesus was sent by Satan, and a sinner. As the Pharisees said, concerning Jesus, "This Man (Jesus) is not from God, because He does not keep the Sabbath" (John 9.16). Note that this is further reiterated in Mark 2.24 when the Pharisees claim that 'Jesus and His disciples break the Sabbath law', as the Pharisees understanding of the Sabbath law was a 'redefined false version of the 3rd Commandment' which was created by their ancestors, not God. Hence, Christ Himself recognized how man had 'amended and redefined the Sabbath' - all to glorify and worship man under the disquise of glorifying and worshiping God - and so did not observe the Sabbath traditions and customs, as they were simply man's laws disguised as God's laws. And so we must consider, if this was the case 2000 years ago, are we so naïve as to think that man's lust for power, authority, control, and wealth somehow evaporated or subsided, and there is no longer the possibility that man would 'redefine the Sabbath'? The fact is that the world we live in today (under the tutelage of our blind Catholic Forefathers) has gone far beyond 'Judaism's redefinition of the Sabbath', with our religious

leaders *tricking* the multitudes into <u>worshiping them</u> and <u>their agendas</u> (i.e., their false gods) every Sunday under the pretense that they are worshiping the one true God; remembering that the <u>true</u> <u>worship of God</u> is simply 'practicing deeds of kindness and mercy'. Therefore, if we are to follow the true words and true persona of Christ (i.e., if we are to <u>truly emulate Christ's example</u>), we will come to the conclusion that showing up to Mass, or any other weekly ceremony or service, is <u>not</u> what Christ would do, as these weekly man-made obligations and Sabbath traditions only promote a <u>mob mentality</u> of *supremacy, exclusion*, and *division*, which is the <u>total antithesis</u> of Christ's message of *equality*, *inclusion*, and *unity*; making it clear that we are <u>not worshiping</u> God or Christ every Sunday, but rather <u>unknowingly worshiping Satan</u>, 'the false god' and Antichrist. Remember, Revelation 12.9 and 13.3-4 says that 'Satan deceives the <u>whole</u> world', and 'All the world marveled and followed the Beast (which encompasses all of our religions), thereby worshiping Satan'.

We must ask ourselves, 'What is the Catholic hierarchy's (or any other religious hierarchy's) motive for obligating people to show up every week to Mass?' Quite simply it is so people slowly and surely absorb Catholicism's 'way of thinking' - that is, Catholicism's propaganda message, the Anti-Good News - into their minds; and that message of course ensures allegiance (through the threat of eternal damnation) to the false god 'Catholicism', and therefore ensures the Catholic hierarchy's COntinued power, glory, and authority. In other words, making people attend Mass, under pain of mortal sin, propagates <u>Catholicism's hidden kingship</u>. This kingship was not so hidden in the Dark Ages, yet by their influence, the Catholic hierarchy did, and still does, indirectly rule people and governments so that they have, for nearly 2000 years, dictated (from behind the scenes) governmental and societal norms which they think will result in unity; with them as kings, of course. Yet, because of their lust for world domination, with everyone 'united' under their rule - just as Hitler (among other brutal dictators) wanted everyone to be 'united' under his rule, only for his own gain - they have blindly influenced governmental and societal norms that have in fact served the ultimate agenda of Satan: the destruction of humanity through 'division, war, and hate' which is thought to be done in the name of Christ and God. So by obligating people to attend Mass every Sunday, the Catholic hierarchy has fallen deep into Satan's **clever trap**, *disseminating* false knowledge (*disguised as* true knowledge), and thereby *brainwashing* people for Satan (who has of course convinced our blind religious leaders that he is God) in order to propagate a false or anti-Good News that will only result in the destruction of humanity. Thus, because the Catholic Forefathers fell for the same temptation as Adam and Eve - i.e., their motivation was the desire to be supreme like a God, having His glory and authority - they have blindly instituted a weekly ceremony, the **Mass**, by which Satan has been able to **disseminate** his evil agenda, all to 'open ears' who show up thinking that they are hearing the agenda of God.

It is interesting to note that Catholicism actually has a theory that puts a 'positive spin' on their slow and methodic brainwashing. They refer to that theory as 'The Law of Gradualness': 'you will gradually become like us the more you are around us'. Their hypothesis is true, but the only problem is that they are gradually teaching 'what is wrong' as 'what is right'; i.e., they, through positive negativity, positively encourage and reinforce the negative. In truth, their law should actually be named 'The Law of Brainwashing': 'the more seeds we plant in your head, the more likely they are to sprout, and you will

gradually (and <u>positively</u>) be <u>brainwashed</u> into believing that our way of thinking is right'. By instituting their Law of Gradualness, the Catholic hierarchy has slowly brainwashed us into <u>openly</u> receiving their propaganda message in order to secure control and power, thus <u>glorifying man</u>, <u>not God</u>. Therefore, by <u>gradually</u> (i.e., slowly and surely as described in their Law of Gradualness) planting into people's minds the Anti-Good News via their <u>weekly mandatory</u> brainwashing sessions (i.e., the Mass), the Catholic hierarchy has succeeded in ensuring allegiance to them - <u>as if</u> people are swearing allegiance to God Himself - thereby ensuring their <u>continued</u> power, glory, and authority.

Ask yourself, 'If throughout the centuries, the Catholic hierarchy was **not** the centerpiece (that is, they did not sit in the seat of power, glory, and authority) of the Mass, would they still insist on obligating our attendance every week?' What if every time we had a Sunday service, the priest (or preacher) took the lowest position of servant, and their existence was not even acknowledged? What if they served us as we took the 'seat of honor' at the weekly banquet, and as we reminded them that 'by serving us they are <u>actually</u> serving Jesus Himself'? Would not these <u>supposedly righteous 'servants'</u> grow resentful of their weekly obligation to bow to us, of course with us insisting the whole time that they are really bowing to Jesus? As an additional note, consider that it is totally contradictory to the true persona of Christ for the religious leaders, in their weekly services, to 'take the highest seat of honor in the name of Christ', when Jesus' words actually say to "Go and sit down in the lowest place" (Luke 14.10). And so we must realize that, if our Sunday services did **not** consist of a priest or preacher sitting in a <u>place of honor</u> as the centerpiece of attention - i.e., a place of spiritual, emotional, and mental supremacy - they would not want their job anymore. They would not want their job anymore if they did not receive 'greetings in the marketplaces, and the respect of men seeking their supposed knowledge as teacher' (Matthew 23.6-7). They would not want their job anymore if they were mere carpenters like Jesus, never receiving any recognition at all. And the fact is that our religious leaders are masters at the art of false humility, pretending to be our servants in order to associate themselves with Jesus, 'the true Servant'. But remember, once their authority is challenged, the religious leaders will show their 'true colors' by swiftly reminding us that 'they have been ordained by God as master, and we are to remain as servant'. And so once their authority is **challenged**, it will become quite obvious that our trusted religious leaders have **not** been ordained by God, but rather by Satan who has disguised himself as God. Thus, when Jesus returns to <u>remove</u> the false man-made ceremonies and Masses that our religious leaders have instituted in His name, it will become quite obvious that our weekly worship services are **not** really about worshiping **God**, but rather about worshiping **man** (i.e., our religious leaders), as our religious leaders (showing their inner demons) will no doubt grit their teeth and hiss, knowing that people will no longer show up every week to honor them, or give them 'greetings in the marketplaces'.

If God wanted man to 'serve the Sabbath' (i.e., serve our religious leaders, not God) as our religions have asserted, why did the Prophets **speak against** the Sabbath services? Why did Jesus Himself **NOT** observe the Sabbath? Are we not supposed to **emulate** Jesus? Who are we really emulating if we are not emulating Jesus? Man? Satan? The following quotes show that, just as today, men who lived 2500 years ago <u>crafted **man-made addendums**</u> to God's Sabbath law, **disguising** those addendums as being 'given by God'. They, just as today, defiled the <u>true intention</u> of the Sabbath in order to glorify

themselves, **not** God. That is, they made addendums to the Sabbath law that ensured, in a **hidden** way, the worship and service of **man** (i.e., the religious leaders), **not** the worship and service of **God**; remembering that to **truly** worship and honor God, we must **only** practice 'deeds of kindness and mercy'. The **following quotes** reiterate that God obviously sees through the **false humility** of our religious leaders, instructing the **true** Prophets to call an **end** to their 'redefined man-made Sabbaths', as they (the Sabbath and other feasts) were all just 'deeds of the law' (just like the **Mass** itself) by which no one would be justified or saved before God.

- 1. Hosea 2.11: "God will cause all her (Israel's) mirth **to cease**, her feast days, New Moons, **Sabbaths**, and **all** her appointed feasts".
- 2. Isaiah 1.11-15: "To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifice to Me (God)? Bring no more <u>futile sacrifice</u> (a '<u>deed of the law</u>') to Me. The New Moons, <u>Sabbaths</u>, assemblies, and sacred meetings; <u>I cannot endure the iniquity</u>... your appointed feasts <u>My soul hates</u>. Even though you make <u>many prayers</u>, I will <u>not</u> hear them."
- 3. Jeremiah's Lamentations 2.6&14: "The Lord has caused the appointed feasts and **Sabbaths** to be **forgotten** in Zion. In His burning indignation He has spurned the king and the **priest**. (O Zion) your (false) prophets have seen for you **false** and **deceptive visions**".

As Jesus says in Mark 2.27, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath". The true and original intention of the Sabbath - i.e., what it means to 'keep holy the Sabbath day' - was to <u>set aside a day when the laborers could rest</u>. Just like most of the Bible, this 3rd Commandment was targeted more at 'the leaders and people in charge' so that they would not take advantage of the labor, not allowing them to rest. That's really the essence of the 3rd Commandment: that the leaders (i.e., management) are not to **overburden** and **oppress** the workforce and labor. That is, leaders should have a mentality of equality, not supremacy, treating the workers the way they would like to be treated, and empathizing with people doing hard labor. And so the Sabbath is a 'gift from God', or "The Sabbath was made for man". The Sabbath was mandated by God so that, at the very least, we would have one day a week to rest, thereby protecting us from oppressive people who seek to enslave us on a continual basis; remembering of course that, when these Commandments were written down by Moses, slavery was **common practice**. The Sabbath represents and symbolizes, if only for one day a week, man's independence from the burdens placed on him by other men. So we can say that the true Sabbath is ultimately symbolic of our freedom that God intended for us to have. Yet, as men have skillfully attached addendums to the Sabbath law that ensure that we worship them (disguised of course as worshiping God) on Sunday, our redefined man-made Sabbath ultimately symbolizes our enslavement to man, and man's (i.e., usually our leaders) ability to manipulate, take advantage of, and dominate over other men (i.e., usually the workers). Therefore, our redefined man-made Sabbath is a symbol of slavery disguised by the religious leaders as a symbol of freedom, and our religious leaders have tricked us into 'serving the Sabbath' (i.e., the religious leaders themselves) instead of 'the Sabbath serving us', as <u>Jesus **instructed**</u> in Mark 2.27. So we must ultimately recognize that, just as the baptism we know

today is an **anti-baptism** that creates *supremacy*, and therefore <u>opposes</u> the *equality* of <u>true water</u> <u>baptism</u>, the <u>redefined man-made Sabbath</u> that we know today is an <u>anti-Sabbath</u> - as it is <u>a symbol of our slavery</u> and how we labor in vain to serve our religions (i.e., <u>false gods</u>) and religious leaders (i.e., <u>false prophets</u>) - which <u>opposes</u> the <u>true intention</u> of the <u>true Sabbath</u>; as the true Sabbath was supposed to be '<u>a symbol of our freedom and independence</u> from the oppression of men'. Again, <u>the redefined man-made Sabbath</u> that we have inherited is an <u>anti-Sabbath</u>, as it opposes everything that the <u>true Sabbath</u> represented. And *ultimately* the <u>anti-Sabbath</u> (i.e., the <u>Mass</u> and any other weekly religious ceremony) that we have been tricked into serving is 'a <u>symbol of man's slavery to Satan'</u> instead of 'a <u>symbol of God's freedom and liberty'</u>.

15. We are the Temple of the Living God

"God, who made the world and everything in it, does not dwell in temples made with human hands" (Acts 17.24). If you were raised Catholic, this verse should sound very contradictory to the entire premise of the Catholic faith. As a Catholic you are taught to believe that 'Jesus is truly present in the tabernacle at all times because that is where the Eucharist is kept'; i.e., the tabernacle in a Catholic Church is thought to be where Jesus, and consequently God 'dwells'. So we must ask the most basic question, if Paul truly believed that 'bread and wine had actually transformed into Jesus' body, blood, soul, and divinity', then Why would he not clarify himself in Acts 17.24 as to 'where Jesus does or does not dwell'? That is, if Paul truly believed, and was in fact preaching Catholicism's asserted true presence of Christ in the **Eucharist**, would Paul <u>not</u> have said, 'God does not dwell in man-made temples, yet there is the one exception of the Eucharist'. But Paul did not say this because the idea of the Eucharist being the true presence (or true 'dwelling', body, blood, soul, and divinity) of Jesus, and consequently God, would **contradict** everything that Paul was trying to convey. The Catholic hierarchy will no doubt say 'Well maybe Paul was not thinking of the <u>Eucharist</u>, an <u>object of worship</u>, at that time'. If this was the case, then why does Paul say in Acts 17.23, the previous verse, "For I was passing through and considering the objects of your worship"? So now, if we are to momentarily put ourselves in Paul's position, we must ask ourselves, 'Would it be possible for me to be supposedly preaching a new message to the world, proclaiming the cornerstone (i.e., the Eucharist) of a new religion (Catholicism) which happens to be an object of worship - and actually be talking about lifeless objects of worship (see verse 29) and how they do not dwell in temples, yet completely forget to mention the Eucharist and how it is the **only** (according to Catholicism) object of worship, with 'supposed life', that **does** dwell in temples'? The truth is that we would have to be the most incompetent person on earth to neglect to mention the Eucharist in this situation and context. Thus, if Paul, in this situation and context in Acts 17.23-24, knew about the Eucharist - i.e., if the Eucharist actually existed - and he forgot to mention it in the context of 'objects of worship' and 'where God does or does not dwell', then we have no business listening to anything Paul says, as his level of incompetency must have been off the charts, babbling incoherently. And so the <u>only logical explanation</u> for Paul's 'supposed' absentmindedness (as Catholic doctrine implies) is that there was never a Eucharist for him to teach about - as it was totally fabricated 'post-Paul' - because if there was this supposed only object of worship, Paul would have A) surely mentioned the Eucharist in the context of Acts 17.23-24, **B)** made a distinction between 'the false presence of a false god in a carved statue' (as he mentions in Acts 17.23&29) and 'the supposed true presence of Jesus in the Eucharist', and C) clarified that indeed 'God, only in the form of the Eucharist, dwells in temples made with human hands'. But Paul said none of these things, and so the fact remains that the Eucharist is a false idol representing the false god 'Catholicism', and it is this false god 'Catholicism' that is the only god that dwells in the Catholic 'temple'. Again, "God, who made the world and everything in it, does not dwell in temples made with human hands".

Man quite simply cannot 'make God' or 'contain God in any man-made structure'. I.e., God made man; man cannot make God. Therefore, it is 'as defiled as it gets' for the Catholic hierarchy to claim the

ability to fabricate (in the form of Jesus) God on an altar. It is 'as defiled as it gets' for the Catholic hierarchy to claim that they can 'contain Jesus' in a man-made structure (i.e., the tabernacle), bringing Him 'in and out of a box' to inflict fear by which they are able to institute their own laws, as if being God's laws. As Solomon says upon completion of his great temple, "But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens <u>Cannot contain You</u>. <u>How much less can this</u> temple which I have built (contain You)!" (1 Kings 8.27). This same idea is echoed again in Acts 7.47-50 when Stephen quotes Isaiah saying "Solomon built (God) a house. However, the Most High does not dwell in temples made with human hands, as the Prophet (Isaiah) says: 'Heaven is My (God's) throne, and earth is My footstool, what house will you build for Me? Has My hand not made all these things?" Therefore, by saying that 'Jesus is contained in the tabernacle', or as many other religions imply (whether **spoken** or **unspoken**) 'God is contained or dwells in their temple', we must recognize that we have ultimately turned our temples into false idols. i.e., a temple = a false idol. Remember from Section 1 that an *idol* is 'any physical, tangible object used to trigger a non-tangible set of beliefs or ideas'. And a non-tangible set of man-made beliefs is considered a false idol's corresponding false god; remembering also that this non-tangible set of man-made beliefs is what we recognize in today's world as a religion or cult. So by making God's presence exclusive to a certain temple, we in fact make the temple into an idol (implied false) by which men can change the persona of God, thereby creating a false persona of God, and consequently a false god (i.e., our religions) that people are tricked into worshiping as if being the one true God. Thus, because all temples on planet earth are actually false idols from behind which Satan is able to continually create multiple false gods (i.e., religions) which keep us from all being united under the one true God, Jesus says that 'Upon His return at the End of the Age, the temples will be destroyed' (see Matthew 24.1-3).

Think about it. God created the world and everything in it - trees, plants, animals, people, rivers, lakes, and mountains - yet somehow forgot to create temples in which we could, as the religious leaders would assert, 'properly worship Him'. God left temples and worship, the 'supposed' most important aspect of our lives, as the religious leaders would assert, up to man and his abilities; remembering of course that Paul says 'God is <u>not worshiped</u> by **anything** men can supply' (Acts 17.25, and see Exodus 20.23). Then, God sends His Son, Jesus, into the physical world and He, not only forgets to construct a temple or convey how He wants one built (as Jesus was a fully capable Carpenter/Builder), but was actually Obsessed with the destruction of man-made temples (see Matthew 24.2). Anyone on this earth with any ability for rational thought should say to themselves 'Something does not add up or make sense'. Anyone on earth with rational thought should say 'Maybe we've missed something that is overwhelmingly obvious?' Maybe 'the way we worship God' is not 'the way God wants us to worship', but rather 'the way Satan (and man) wants us to worship'? If the 'division, war, and hate' of this world is a direct result of our different temple worship practices, does that not clearly indicate that Satan is the catalyzing force for the Way we worship? Thus, Jesus did not forget to build or draw plans for a temple when He was here because His ultimate plan was to **destroy** the temples. And so we must come to understand that our temple and worship practices (i.e., rituals, ceremonies, circumcisions, sacraments, or any deed of any religious law) are the work of Satan, and constitute false worship that creates

supremacy and exclusion (i.e., our public relationship with God is <u>better than</u> your public relationship with God), which ultimately leads to 'division, war, and hate'; noting that the <u>true worship</u> of God, simply 'loving others as ourselves', <u>needs no temple</u> - as it is essentially 'worshiping in spirit' (see John 4.23-24), <u>not</u> with a specific religious deed - thereby <u>eliminating</u> the possibility of a temple being used as a false idol.

We must realize that a temple or church is the 'most likely place' where Satan begins his work, doing so under the **disguise** of God's name and God's house. Satan sows his seeds of error where many, especially in Catholicism, believe that it is **forbidden** for him to even be present. But this is **not** so. **We** fool ourselves, and pass that foolishness down through the generations, by believing that a church or temple is 'hallowed ground' and somehow off-limits to a demon (i.e., Satan) who knows no boundaries. As Paul says in 2 Thessalonians 2.4 'The man of lawlessness (the Pope, who unknowingly serves Satan) will even go in and sit down in God's temple and claim to be God'. Jeremiah 23.11 says "For both (false) prophet and priest are profane; Yes **in My house** I have found their wickedness, says the Lord". Over and over again, the Old Testament shows how God's house was used for deceptive and idolatrous motives of control and power. All of the false prophets and profane priests would speak 'the deceit of their own heart, using their tongues and then saying 'God says'' (Jeremiah 23.26 and 31). And they spoke their lies from the **power position** of a *temple* (i.e., false idol): a large impressive structure, with gold and ornamentations, where people, out of shear awe, will listen attentively as false prophets and profane priests *redefine* God into their own false god. Today's Catholic hierarchy is no different than the false prophets and profane priests of the Old Testament. They too speak their own words, only to assert that **God spoke them**. They too 'put words in the mouth of God', effectively breaking the 2nd Commandment and committing idolatry by making their religion itself into 'a false god that they <u>insist</u> is the real God'. And they do it all by speaking from the <u>power position</u> of their temple: a place where they can hold people captive, locking down all of their Visual senses with fine paintings and gold statues (i.e., other false idols) in order to essentially hypnotize them, and hence easily whisper Satan's clever lies into 'an only too open eared multitude of blind followers'. Again, our man-made temples, churches, synagogues, and mosques are the places where Satan begins his work, under the *disguise* of being God's work. And our religious leaders (i.e., false prophets) have <u>polluted the</u> land and made the multitudes of people desolate by setting their temples (i.e., false idols) on every **hilltop** and on **every street corner** (see Jeremiah 3.6).

Additionally, the <u>New Covenant</u> that Jesus sealed by dying on the cross states that 'God's laws are written on our hearts (if they are not <u>fully hardened</u>), therefore <u>no one shall teach</u> their neighbor about <u>God'</u>. The <u>very presence</u> of temples and churches in our world today means that we have <u>ignored</u> the <u>New Covenant</u>, as the temple is always 'the place' where religious leaders and elders '<u>teach'</u> the <u>multitudes their false</u>, warped persona of <u>God</u>. The temple is 'the place' where, under the blind direction of our religious leaders, we make, what the New Covenant says should be <u>a private</u>, direct relationship with <u>God</u>, into <u>a public relationship</u>; remembering that Jesus says 'Don't be like the <u>hypocrites</u> who stand up in the <u>temples</u> making a public spectacle, but <u>talk to God privately</u> in your

room' (Matthew 6.5-6). Once this relationship is a <u>public</u> spectacle, the temple becomes 'the place' where we form 'mobs' who think they have a <u>better way</u> of worshiping God than 'the next mob'. This supremacy turns to judgment, and ultimately division and violence. And it all begins by 'the forming of a <u>mob'</u> at our local temples and churches; that is, our local 'houses of division'. If you think this is not true, then consider that the <u>temple</u> was most likely the meeting place where the religious leaders and elders <u>hatched their scheme</u> to pass judgment on Jesus and have Him murdered. Thus, our <u>temples</u> are in <u>direct violation</u> of the New Covenant, promoting and propagating the <u>teaching of lies</u> about God and Jesus; which in turn ultimately leads to 'division, war, and hate'.

To further reiterate that **both** <u>Jesus</u> and the <u>true Prophets</u> believed that **temples** (i.e., synagogues, churches, mosques, etc.) were <u>inherently evil</u>, being used continuously as a place for Satan to plant his <u>hidden lies</u> that eventually produce supremacy, exclusion, judgment, and hypocrisy (which are the **precursors** of *'division*, war, and hate'), examine the **following quotes**.

- 1. John 4.21: "Jesus said to (the woman at Jacob's well), 'Woman, believe Me, the hour is coming when you will neither on this mountain, nor (in the temple) in Jerusalem, worship the Father'." Note that the 'mountain' here is referring to Mount Gerizim in Samaria where the Samaritans performed their own worship practices or 'deeds of the law'.
- 2. Matthew 24.1-2: "Then Jesus went out and departed from the **temple**, and His disciples came up to show Him the buildings of the **temple**. And Jesus said to them, 'Do you not see all these things? Assuredly, I say to you, not one stone shall be left here upon another, that shall not be thrown down'." Note that this does not refer to 'the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem in 70 AD', as Matthew 24.3 clarifies that 'this destruction of the temple' will be at 'the End of the Age'.
- 3. Matthew 6.5: "And when you pray, <u>you shall **not**</u> be like the **hypocrites**. For they love to pray <u>standing in the **temples**</u> and on the corners of the streets, that they may be <u>seen by men</u>."
- 4. Ezekiel 9.6-7: God said to His angels "Utterly <u>slay</u> (all the <u>idolaters</u>), old and young men, maidens and little children and women, and <u>begin</u> at <u>My sanctuary</u>. So they (i.e., God's angels) began with the <u>elders</u> who were before the <u>temple</u>. Then <u>God said</u> to them, '<u>Defile the</u> <u>temple</u>, and fill the courts with the slain. Go out!" Note that <u>God said</u> to 'defile and desecrate the temple', thereby <u>showing His obvious disgust</u> with the actions of the priests and elders of the temple.
- 5. Revelation 21.22: "But I saw **no temple** in it (i.e., the new world after the 2nd coming of Christ), for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are its temple."

Thus, since all *physical*, *tangible* temples (i.e., temples with 4 walls and a roof) act as *false idols* from behind which Satan tricks false prophets into creating false gods, Jesus will return at the End of the Age

to destroy all of our COrruptible man-made temples (see Matthew 24.1-3), thereby leaving 'Jesus' body of true believers' as the only standing incorruptible true temple; realizing that this 'only true temple' is a 'metaphorical temple' made up of 'a body or group of people', which is explained as follows. Recall from Section 2 that 'the body of Christ' means either 'Christ's actual, living, breathing physical body' or 'Christ's body of people who believe in Him'. And at the same time these '2 bodies' mysteriously mean the same thing, being interchangeable terms, as 'Christ feels in His actual body what His body of people feel'. Knowing this, Jesus says in John 2.19-21, "'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up'. But He was speaking of the **temple** of His **body**." So now realizing that, while there was 'an actual temple of Christ's physical body' that was raised from the dead in three days, there was also, after seeing Christ die and losing all hope, a 'metaphorical temple of Christ's body of people who believed in Him' that was 'raised from the dead' so to speak, after seeing Him alive once again. Note here that 'being raised from the dead' still does not mean that 'the body is whole and complete'; that will only occur when Christ returns. Therefore, we can see that the only true temple remembering that "God does not dwell in temples made with human hands" - is not 'a literal temple in the traditional sense, made of <u>inanimate stones</u>', but rather 'a <u>metaphorical temple</u> made of <u>livina</u> stones', where living stones = individual people (as described in the following paragraph) so that **many living stones** (or a **body** of people) = <u>a living temple</u>. I.e., 'Christ's <u>body of people</u> who believe in Him' = 'the only true temple of Living God and the Living Christ' (Revelation 21.22). Or simply 'a body of people' = 'a figurative temple', knowing of course that this 'figurative temple' is built around 'the literal temple or body of the living, breathing Christ', which is the 'Cornerstone' of our temple. Hence, knowing that 'people = temple', Paul says in 2 Corinthians 6.16, "We (living stones) are the temple of the **Living God"**. And this 'living temple of living beings', as opposed to 'dead, inanimate temples that house false (or dead) gods', is the **only true temple** of God.

So as many times as we have heard the word 'church', 'temple', 'synagogue', or 'mosque', we must understand that the only true church or temple is us (i.e., humanity), and every physical church or temple with 4 walls and a roof, in the customary sense, is a false church or temple (i.e., false idol), as it merely contains false inanimate gods; whereas we, living beings, contain the Living God (i.e., the breath of life from God's Spirit). Just as when Jesus used terms like 'flesh and blood' in the figurative sense (see Section 7), we must realize that Jesus and the Apostles used the term 'temple' in a figurative sense. In this figurative sense, each person is like a stone, and if we all unite into one body of people (i.e., 'the body of Christ' as in 1 Corinthians 12.27), we will figuratively come together to make a figurative temple (not a literal temple). This is why Peter said "Come living stones, and let yourselves be used in building the spiritual temple, where you will serve as holy priests to offer spiritual and acceptable sacrifices (not actual burnt offerings or 'deeds of the law') to God through Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 2.5). Here Peter is comparing a person to a stone - the standard building block of their day used in constructing physical (or literal) temples - so that 'people', not actual stones make up the one and only true church or temple of God. And so if we come together as 'living stones' then we will form the one true living temple of the Living God and the Living Christ. I.e., 'living people (or beings) make up the

<u>living temple</u> of the <u>Living God</u> and the <u>Living Jesus</u>' (Revelation 21.22). Like Peter, Paul also figuratively compares 'people to stones', with Jesus being the Chief Cornerstone of God's temple. "You too are built upon the foundation laid by the Apostles and Prophets, the Chief Cornerstone being Christ Jesus Himself. He is the One who holds the whole building together and makes it grow into a sacred temple dedicated to the Lord" (Ephesians 2.20-21). Hebrews 3.6 also says 'But Christ is a Son over His own house, whose house We are if we have confidence and hope to the end'; again making the connection that 'we, Christ's body of people' = 'the house or temple of Christ'. And so we must understand that a *church* (especially in the New Testament), *temple*, *house*, *etc.* represented 'the *living* <u>body of people</u> in a certain area', <u>not</u> a physical establishment. I.e., a '<u>church</u>' is 'a **living** group of people', not 'a **dead** physical structure made of actual stones by human hands'. To reiterate, God's temple is alive, not dead; such as all of the temples in our world which we have been programmed and brainwashed to believe are God's temples. Thus, the only true church or temple of God is humanity: 'the living temple of the Living God and the Living Jesus' (Revelation 21.22). And after Christ returns to <u>destroy</u> all of the <u>false</u> churches, temples, synagogues, mosques, etc. (i.e., *false idols*) that house or contain our *false gods* (i.e., our *religions*), 'humanity', 'the temple of the Living God', will be the **one** and **only church** or **temple** that is left still standing so that 'God is finally **one**' (Zechariah 14.9). Again, "We are the (one and only true) temple of the Living God", and every other physical temple (i.e., 'house of division') on earth is actually 'a false temple of Satan' that only divides God and His people.

16. The Catholic Church's Prison of Sexual Guilt and Judgment

Apart from food and shelter, sexuality is primal to all humanity. If Satan can turn sex into something defiled and evil, then he will have succeeded in making humanity 'appear to be evil' for simply desiring nothing more than 'what God has preprogrammed and hardwired humanity to desire'. God designed humans to desire sex. That is, sexual ambition is not a disease that we are cursed with, rather it is a gift. But, Satan - disguised as God, of course - and his ministers want us to believe that 'if we desire sex, then we somehow fell off of God's assembly line as being <u>defective</u>'. And so we must realize that Satan's agenda consists of suppressing our natural sexual desires by using the most powerful weapon of guilt and **shame**. Remember, Satan is a master at <u>redefining</u> 'true right' and 'true wrong' (see Isaiah 5.20 and John 16.8) in order to create normalized slavery, imprisonment, confusion, and conflict among God's people. Therefore, by projecting unrighteous guilt and shame on human sexuality - i.e., by making 'what is right' seem wrong - Satan and his blind religious leaders are able to <u>cause</u> (and have caused for thousands of years) unfathomable internal conflicts between a person's heart and a person's mind, as well as external conflicts (i.e., person to person, group to group, nation to nation, etc.). In other words, by redefining the righteousness of our human sexuality, Satan is able to make people judge A) the sexuality of themselves, and **B)** the sexuality of others in an unrighteous manner that usually does not agree with what God has written on our hearts; of course thereby causing - through unrighteous judgment, and its subsequent projection of guilt and shame - internal and external COnflicts that are based on Satan's false personas of Jesus and God. And as these internal and external conflicts have reached a boiling point over the centuries, they have no doubt fueled Satan's main objective: 'the destruction of humanity through division, war, and hate'. Thus, we must ultimately come to the conclusion that 'our sexual ambition is **nOt** a disease', as the Catholic hierarchy and most other religious leaders will assert, in an unspoken or spoken way. And we are not defective for naturally desiring 'what we are simply hardwired and made to desire': **SEX**.

The Catholic hierarchy says 'Why can't we talk about something other than sexuality?' But they are blind in that they have restricted people's personal liberty, and so people are naturally resisting Catholicism's normalized slavery and emotional imprisonment. They have essentially told people 'how to feel', and so people's hearts - where God resides - have instinctively revolted. The Catholic leaders, and consequently most other religious leaders, have placed their sexual restrictions and guidelines on our personal lives, and then they wonder 'Why is sex the most debated topic in the Catholic Church?' Think about it. Most every argument or debate within the Catholic Church is related to sex: abortion, the celibacy of priests, no female priests, no use of contraception, no in vitro fertilization, no remarriage after a divorce, no true acceptance of homosexuals, no premarital sex, and the forbidding of remarried people from receiving the Eucharist. In particular, 'forbidding remarried people from receiving the Eucharist' is in itself warped. The Catholic Church is actually forbidding something that they say is good, but is actually evil, thereby making people unknowingly desire evil even more. It is Satan 'at his best' using reverse psychology to get us to follow his false knowledge of 'true right' and 'true wrong'. I.e., by saying 'you can't have something that is evil', actually makes people want it even more.

And so the simple fact that all of these issues are constantly at the <u>forefront</u> of Catholic debates should *signify* a <u>fundamental</u> underlying problem rooted <u>deep</u> within Catholic doctrine. Unfortunately, the seeds of Satan's sadistic lies are rooted <u>so</u> deep in Catholicism that <u>'Jesus in the flesh'</u> is the only One who can <u>'shake them out of their fog of inherited, degenerative thought patterns'</u>. But the only problem is that, when Jesus does reappear, the Catholic hierarchy will <u>repeat history</u> and <u>believe that the real</u> <u>Christ is actually the Antichrist</u>; remembering of course that the Pharisees and Teachers of the Law (i.e., the Catholic hierarchy's <u>predecessors</u>) <u>also</u> believed that <u>'Jesus was sent by Satan'</u>. The truth about human sexuality is written on our hearts by God, yet we have allowed <u>ignorant men</u> to <u>infiltrate</u> our <u>minds</u>, thereby <u>silencing</u> and <u>hardening</u> our <u>hearts</u>. Thus, the only way to realize the truth about our sexuality, and put an <u>end</u> to all of the <u>senseless Catholic debates</u> about sexuality, is to <u>in turn silence</u> the ignorant, naked (i.e., <u>without the true knowledge of Jesus or God</u>) <u>'loudmouths'</u> of the Catholic hierarchy (among many other religious leaders of Islam, Protestantism, etc.) by <u>'planting our minds firmly</u> in our <u>hearts'</u>.

It is important to note that, by these ignorant men misinterpreting 'Adam and Eve's metaphorical nakedness (i.e., ignorance)' as 'physical nakedness' (see Section 1), they have demonized nakedness and sexuality, and hence warped our minds. You must realize that it is not even possible for their interpretation to be correct because it implies that 'it was not sinful for Adam and Eve to be naked, then sometime <u>after</u> they ate from the tree of Satan's false knowledge, <u>nakedness **suddenly** became sinful</u>'; even though Adam and Eve were considered to be <u>married</u>. In other words, it is total nonsense to say that *nakedness* was **not** sinful, then was **all of a sudden** sinful, when you consider that **God is** unchanging, and 'the same God yesterday, today, and tomorrow'. Again, as stated in Section 1, all of the biblical interpretations that we have inherited from our religious forefathers consider Adam and Eve's figurative nakedness (i.e., the ignorance of 'true right' and 'true wrong') to be literal nakedness, thereby missing the entire meaning of the story of Adam and Eve. Adam and Eve, out of a lust to be 'supreme like God', blindly consumed Satan's poisonous fruit of false knowledge, making them believe that 'their oppressive practices over their own people were God-like', when in actuality, they were tricked into unknowingly being 'Satan-like' (i.e., 'Satan deceived me, and I ate', Genesis 3.13). And so they were spiritually blind, spiritually naked, and therefore unashamed of their ignorance of the true persona of God. But when Jesus gave them true sight (or knowledge of the true persona of God), they looked down to see for the first time their figurative nakedness (i.e., ignorance), and were ashamed. Thus, when the Catholic hierarchy, as well as all of our other blind religious leaders, realize that they, considering themselves <u>literary scholars</u>, have *mistaken* figurative language <u>as</u> literal language - thereby of course misleading multitudes into the sexual desolation, oppression, and slavery of Catholicism's prison of sexual guilt and judgment - they too will look down for the first time and be greatly ashamed of their figurative nakedness, and be overwhelmed with guilt for having been 'the blind leader who leads blind followers into a ditch' (Matthew 15.14).

Have you ever wondered why most people in the Old Testament <u>had children by **multiple** wives</u>, yet somehow after Jesus arrived, everyone '<u>supposedly'</u> **cursed** their own sexuality, according to Catholic doctrine? Not to dictate whether or not we should have multiple wives (or husbands), but what does it say about 'God's view of sexual righteousness' when <u>Jacob</u> fathered <u>12 sons</u>, who ultimately became the

12 Tribes of Israel, by 4 different women? What does it say about the celibacy of the Pope when he claims lineage to Peter, who was in fact a married man (1 Corinthians 9.5 and Matthew 8.14)? What does it say about the righteousness of the celibacy of priests when Paul asserts that church leaders must have only one wife (1 Timothy 3.2)? Obviously Paul did not believe in restraining a church leader's sexuality. The simple truth is that false, sexually sterilized personas (or identities) have been fabricated by the early Catholic Church Fathers for people they never even met; in particular the Apostles. And so just like the lies that they have spoken in Christ's name, the Catholic hierarchy has also 'spoken lies into most other names in the Bible'. Thus, the Catholic Forefathers have effectively breathed new, defiled, sexually sterilized life into names of the Bible, thereby creating fictitious characters (i.e., a fictitious, sexually sterilized Paul, a fictitious, sexually sterilized Peter, a fictitious, sexually sterilized Mary, and of course a fictitious, sexually sterilized Jesus) that never even existed. And by these fictitious characters, Catholicism has become responsible for inflicting sexual desolation on the entire world, which in turn has caused unfathomable and exponential internal and external conflicts that are not, and never have been, the will of God, but rather the will of Satan, who disguises himself as God to our blind religious leaders.

Catholicism's doctrine, and consequently the doctrine of most other religions, on anything and everything pertaining to human sexuality is the hidden cause of many internal conflicts between a person's heart and mind, which leads to external conflicts; starting at 'person to person', then leading to 'group to group', and ultimately 'nation to nation'. In the Catholic Church, the internal conflicts that priests and nuns have about their own sexuality (i.e., the sexual guilt and shame that 'Satan disguised as Jesus' has inflicted on them), and ultimately their oath of celibacy, validates the idea that 'it was right for them to feel sexual guilt and shame'. And so by exalting this 'oath of sexual sterilization' as something that is in accordance with the will of Jesus and God, we set that level of 'celibacy and sexual sterilization' as a standard or 'bar' that must be kept in order to be considered truly 'holy' or 'Christlike'. But this level of sexual sterilization is **not at all** 'Christ-like' - that is, it is based on a fictitious Jesus - and to project the idea that 'anything less than celibate is falling short of being like Christ' is the **degenerative** thought pattern of *quilt* and *shame* that we have inherited from the Catholic Forefathers; which <u>again</u> they have based on <u>literal interpretations</u> of a verse that is in fact <u>figurative</u>. That verse is **Matthew 19.12**: "For there are eunuchs who were born thus from their mother's womb, and there are eunuchs who were made eunuchs by men, and there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He who is able to accept it, let him accept it." Remember, most sexual language in the Bible is used as imagery to figuratively convey the actions of people committing idolatry; i.e., 'adultery between man and God', not 'adultery between man and woman' (see Section 17). The sexual language in the Bible is figuratively speaking about the impurities of 'oppressing and enslaving' your fellow man; which is ultimately the product of idolatry. I.e., idolatry causes 'division, war, and hate'. So it is Violence and Oppression that are the real impurities before God, not Sexuality. As Genesis 6.13 says "And God said to Noah, 'The end of all flesh has come before Me, for the earth is filled with Violence through them; and behold, I will destroy them with the earth

(i.e., a flood)". Likewise, Joshua 5.6 says that 'God kept the Israelites in the desert for **40** years in order to kill off all of the <u>violent</u> men of war'. Again, the Bible's sexual language is **figuratively** referring to the <u>impurities</u> of violence and oppression that are 'the products of idolatry'. Yet the Catholic hierarchy has misinterpreted this 'figurative language as literal language', and consequently that 'sexuality is inherently impure', thereby misleading themselves into exalting their 'oath of sexual sterilization', and consequently projecting on the multitudes unrighteous guilt, shame, and judgment about their natural sexuality; of course therefore placing the multitudes in 'a prison of sexual guilt, shame, and judgment'. And so the following lays out the true interpretation for Matthew 19.12, recognizing that 'this verse' and 'the verses setting up this verse' are indeed using figurative sexual language, not literal sexual language.

In Matthew 19.1-12, the Pharisees wanted to test Jesus, asking Him about divorce on an literal individual level. But what our blind religious leaders do not understand is that Jesus responded to the Pharisees, not speaking on an literal individual level, but on a figurative macro level of 'God to His people'; remembering from Section 1 that **idolatry** must be examined on 'a long term international level', not 'a short term interpersonal level'. And Jesus of course did this because it was the Pharisees (in particular their forefathers, see 1 Kings 11.33) who had committed 'figurative adultery' by going off - as a large 'national' group considered to be God's/Jesus' bride - and fornicating with Satan. The fact that Jesus is speaking in terms of 'Bridegroom (i.e., Jesus) and bride (i.e., a group of people or humanity itself)' on a macro level (not an individual level) is made clear by noticing that both Matthew 19.5 and **Ephesians 5.31** - "For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh" - are identical, with Paul then saying in the following verse (Ephesians 5.32) that 'the man = Christ' and 'the wife = the church or Christ's body of people'. I.e., Ephesians 5.32 says "But I speak concerning Christ and the church, which is a great mystery". Also notice that Matthew 19.4 says "He who made them at the beginning made them male and female". This parallels John 1.1-3, 'In the beginning was the Word (i.e., Jesus), and all things (including His wife, 'humanity') were made through the Word'; which of course is itself a parallel to the metaphor of 'Eve being made from Adam' in Genesis 2.22. Hence, by recognizing the parallels between A) Matthew 19.5 and Ephesians 5.31, and B) Matthew 19.4 and John 1.1-3, we know that Jesus, in the context of Matthew 19.1-12, was speaking on a *figurative* macro level about 'Himself and humanity', not about individual 'men and women'. So Jesus was effectively saying here that 'it was right for God to divorce Himself from His people', as they had committed fornication (see Matthew 19.9) with Satan; noting that **Jeremiah 3.8** says that 'God had written <u>Israel</u> (i.e., the <u>nation</u>) a <u>certificate of divorce</u> for her <u>harlotry</u> and adultery'. And additionally (still speaking about Matthew 19.9), if any false prophet or false husband (i.e., Satan's human stand-ins) marries themselves to the divorced bride of God/Jesus, then they have committed adultery; noting that, on a macro level, Jesus is directly saying 'Satan has married himself to **Jesus' divorced bride**, thereby **committing adultery** against **God'**.

Furthermore, it must be noted that Matthew 19.5 has been used by ignorant Christians to assert Jesus' <u>supposed</u> opposition to <u>homosexuality</u>. But, now knowing that this verse is <u>figuratively</u> speaking about 'Christ and the church', and <u>not</u> about 'marriage on an <u>individual</u> level between <u>man and woman</u>', their

assertion is proven to be false, thereby **nullifying** any argument that 'Jesus condemned homosexuals'. And again, by knowing that this verse (Matthew 19.5) is figuratively speaking about 'Christ and the church', we can now recognize that the line "What God has joined together, let no man separate" (Matthew 19.6) is <u>directly targeted</u> at the <u>Pharisees</u> who were 'the men responsible for separating Christ from His wife (i.e., people)'; which consequently means that Matthew 19.6 does not pertain to 'people being joined in marriage under Catholicism (or any other religion) and then separating or divorcing' as if 'to be joined in marriage under the false god Catholicism' is the same as 'being joined together by God'. As a side note, we must realize that many people have been married throughout the centuries based solely on 'what parents and church will accept'; which of course is based on a false persona of God. When these marriages do not work out because it was not what was truly in their hearts, these couples live in a state of guilt and shame as if they have 'separated something that God joined together', when in reality the marriage is something that was joined together by one of Satan's false gods (i.e., our religions). So the couple's guilt and shame is an <u>unrighteous</u> projection by our religions (namely Catholicism), as the two people may have never gotten married in the first place if it was not for pressure from parents and church to 'marry within the confines of their religion'. Thus, ultimately we must realize that many have been joined together by our false gods (i.e., our religions), and **not God**, therefore these people should feel absolutely **no** guilt or shame because they were **never with** the person that God truly intended for them anyway.

Now returning to the explanation of Matthew 19.12, the Apostles - also not grasping that Jesus was figuratively speaking essentially about 'Him and His bride (i.e., the people of God)' - wonder (in Matthew 19.10) if it is better to not get literally married. Jesus then tells them in verse 11 that 'They cannot understand what He has just said unless it is revealed to them by God'; noting that Jesus, in verse 11, is identifying 'His words to the Pharisees' as 'a saying' or 'a parable', alluding to the fact that it has hidden meaning. The following verse, Matthew 19.12, is the single verse that Catholicism has misinterpreted, thereby leading generations of Catholic priests and nuns to lead a life of celibacy - not to mention projecting unrighteous sexual guilt and shame on the multitudes - that was not at all the will or intention of Christ. Again, Matthew 19.12 says, "For there are eunuchs who were born thus from their mother's womb, and there are eunuchs who were made eunuchs by men, and there are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He who is able to accept it, let him accept it." A eunuch is a sterilized male by A) a birth defect, or B) forced castration, who therefore cannot produce offspring. Now knowing that Christ has set up the scenario that 'God has divorced Israel because of her fornication' - meaning that Jesus too was not presently figuratively married to His bride and also knowing that 'the marriage of Christ will not occur Until His return (see Revelation 19.7)', Christ, likening Himself to the other 2 types of literal eunuchs, is therefore metaphorically saying that 'He is a **figurative** eunuch who will **not** produce **qodly offsprinq** until He marries His bride'. Note that Ezekiel 23.4 gives an example of God's brides, Samaria and Jerusalem, figuratively fornicating with the Syrians and their idols, and thus producing bastard children, or ungodly offspring (notice also here that God had 2 wives). So ultimately Jesus was saying that 'the Pharisees were themselves children of fornication' (see John 8.41), as their forefathers left God to fornicate with Satan and his false gods;

realizing that the religion of Judaism had itself become an *'unseen'* or *'unidentified'* false god through the intermingling with other false gods. Thus, by Catholicism <u>misinterpreting</u> Matthew 19.1-11 on an <u>individual, literal level</u>, instead of a <u>macro, figurative level</u> between Christ and His people, they have used Matthew 19.12 to essentially *force <u>castration</u>* on their priests, making them believe that they are doing so to <u>emulate</u> Christ; which they are **not**. And by forcing this *castration* and *sexual sterilization* on priests and nuns in the name of Christ, Satan, through the Catholic Forefathers, has succeeded in causing <u>normalized inner conflict</u> that is portrayed as being <u>righteous</u> due to <u>association</u> with Christ.

Therefore, by **exalting** their 'oath of sterilization' as being a **Christ-like**, and portraying this oath as a 'form of enlightenment' (as it is actually <u>false enlightenment</u>), the Catholic hierarchy projects an uncleanliness on 'anything falling short of this level of sterilization'. And because of their false enlightenment, the Catholic hierarchy truly believes that they are somehow endowed with the authority from God to dictate 'right and wrong' for everyone else's sexual practices. But they have no right to dictate anything to us about our sexuality, and their false authority to enforce 'sexual rules' is a false honor bestowed upon them by Satan in order to cause, in their followers, internal conflict between their heart and mind, which is no doubt the Seed of much external conflict. Think about it. Cutting off people's natural sexuality is like 'holding a river back with a dam'. And once the flood comes, the dam can no longer hold back the river. When people's 'sexual dam' gives out because they can no longer contain their 'flood of God-given desires', it can cause external conflicts like priests and elders molesting children, rape, murder, and domestic abuse. To understand this further, consider the idea that 'starving people of sex and then wondering why there are **sexual-based crimes**' is like 'starving people of food and then wondering why people are fighting and killing each other to get something to eat'. Additionally, the guilt and shame that is projected by Catholicism on those having sex outside their approved sexual practices is the *cause* of external conflicts like *abortions, depression, suicides,* and countless family conflicts. And the judgment of other people's sexuality by Catholicism (whether homosexual, bisexual, divorced, remarried, artificially inseminated, etc.) has no doubt *caused*, at best, emotional desolation, and at worst, senseless and brutal violence. Thus, the Catholic hierarchy's normalized doctrine on 'anything and everything pertaining to human sexuality', and their consequential cutting off, restraining, and manipulating of people's natural sexuality, is the hidden **Cause** (as it is *disguised* with the righteous name of Christ) of many *internal* and *external* conflicts. Make no mistake that 'cutting off, restraining, and manipulating people's natural sexuality with guilt, shame, and judgment' is Spiritual Sexual abuse; which of course includes 'mental and emotional sexual abuse'. And the fact that spiritual sexual abuse is hidden and normalized makes it every bit as abnormal and violent as physical sexual abuse.

Hence, we must come to realize (by listening to our hearts) that Catholicism's, and consequently most other religion's, **projected** guilt, shame, and judgment on human sexuality - i.e., their spiritual sexual abuse - is **not normal** or **Christ-like**, but **highly abnormal** and **Satan-like**; remembering that by the Catholic hierarchy eating Satan's poisonous fruit of **false** knowledge, they **truly**, yet **blindly**, **believe** that 'what they stand for' is **normal** and **God-like**. Furthermore, making the truth even harder to recognize, this highly abnormal doctrine has been **exalted** by centuries and generations of **blind** and **degenerative**

Catholic theologians who sell their 'normalized sexual sterilization, and subsequent spiritual sexual abuse of the multitudes' as a sort of enlightenment and spiritual freedom. But just as Satan disguises his darkness as light, generations of degenerate Catholic theologians have also peddled 'the darkness of their sexual oppression and imprisonment' as 'the light of Christ'; of course creating 'Catholicism's worldwide prison of sexual quilt and judgment' which equates to nothing more than false enlightenment. Think about it. What the Catholic hierarchy and their forefathers have done is essentially like 'throwing people in prison for getting hungry and then eating', as 'wanting sex' is just as natural as 'wanting food'; i.e., they are **both** primal and instinctual. Again, the Catholic Forefathers are no different than Adam and Eve; 'the serpent deceived them and they ate his false knowledge of good and evil' (Genesis 3.13). And so by cutting off, restraining, and manipulating people's natural sexuality with their false enlightenment of unrighteous guilt, shame, and judgment, the Catholic hierarchy and their forefathers are guilty of sexually abusing and imprisoning the souls of this world in the hidden, unseen spiritual realm... and they don't even know what they blindly do, just as Adam and Eve, and just as those crucifying Christ (see Luke 23.34). And the Catholic Church's normalized sexual guilt, shame, and judgment that they project on the entire world has most definitely made Jesus' words pertaining to 'the end time' come true. "Because lawlessness will abound, the love of many will grow <u>cold</u>" (Matthew 24.12). Among other man-made laws, Catholicism's warped sexual doctrine is <u>Satan's</u> law disguised as God's law. Therefore, as a result of 'the unrighteous imprisonment of our human sexuality' and 'the unrighteous judgment of the sexuality of others' - which are products of Catholicism's lawlessness - 'many people's love has grown cold and their hearts hardened'; realizing of course that they have been tricked into being 'cold and hardened' because it has been sold to them by Satan and his blind ministers as actually being *Christ-like, normal,* and *enlightened*.

And so again, as mentioned earlier, 'the fictitious sexually sterilized Jesus' that early Catholicism has created, and then passed down to us as 'the real Jesus', is the reason for the sexual desolation and 'coldness' that we see today. The sexual desolation inflicted on the world by the Catholic Church is ultimately a product of the Abomination of Desolation; i.e., the Eucharist. By speaking lies about the true Jesus from behind a false Jesus (i.e., the Eucharist), the Catholic hierarchy has basically rewritten the true identity of Jesus, thereby distorting His sexuality, which in turn distorts our **<u>sexuality</u>**. As a note, it is not merely a coincidence that Daniel 11.37 (regarding the Abomination of Desolation) says that 'He will not desire women', expressly prophesying about the celibate Catholic Pope (or 'hidden king'), who essentially has, by his (and his hierarchy's) 'oath of celibacy', 'sold his **sexuality** in exchange for **power** and **glory**, as this 'oath of celibacy' is of course esteemed by many as being **Christ-like** (which equals control and power by <u>association</u>), while in truth this '<u>literal</u> celibacy' is **not** Christ-like at all. And so it is of utmost importance to know the true persona of Christ, or else, as seen with Catholicism's misinterpretation of Matthew 19.12, millions upon millions of people will feel guilt and shame about absolutely nothing, all with the intention of the living up to, or emulating, a 'sexually sterilized false persona of Christ' that never existed. Hence we must come to the realization that 'erasing Christ's sexuality from existence and claiming that He did not want or have sex' sets up an inhuman standard of sexual sterilization. I.e., saying that 'Christ did not have or want sex' actually makes Him 'less than human', not 'more than human', as Catholicism asserts.

Additionally, Catholicism has also produced mountains of warped, sexual doctrine based on a 'false, less than human persona of Mary (the mother of Jesus)'. And so a large portion of the Catholic Church's erroneous sexual doctrine stems from the false belief that 'Mary was a perpetual virgin' and 'Jesus never had sex'. First of all, who can make such a claim? Is someone in the Catholic hierarchy 2000 years old? Therefore, we must realize that no one of the Catholic hierarchy has ever met Mary or Jesus. And even if they did, how would it be possible for them to monitor every move for Mary and Jesus' entire adult lives in order to verify their abstinence from sexual intercourse? So let's first explore some of the facts written about Mary in the Bible - as there is a fair amount of evidence pertaining to Mary not remaining a virgin - then second, explore what is written about Jesus; which is not very much, meaning that Catholicism has essentially fabricated their 'sexually sterilized false Jesus' from no more than 1 verse (i.e., Matthew 19.12), which has already been discussed.

The Catholic hierarchy totally and blatantly <u>ignores</u> and <u>rejects</u> all of the references to Jesus' <u>brothers</u> and <u>sisters</u> in <u>Scripture</u> that <u>clearly indicate</u> '<u>Mary was NOT</u> a perpetual virgin'. Mary may have conceived Jesus being a virgin, but that <u>never</u> implies she <u>remained</u> a virgin; nor should she. The Catholic hierarchy projects the idea that '<u>Mary would somehow defile herself</u> if she was to have sexual intercourse with a man'. And this, in itself, <u>falsely projects the idea that 'sexuality is inherently impure</u>'. Therefore, we must <u>not</u> think of Mary as <u>impure</u> for <u>not remaining</u> a virgin; that warped mentality is a product of the Catholic hierarchy's <u>false enlightenment</u>, and is consequently the <u>false light</u> that they project on human sexuality. Examine the <u>following quotes</u> which <u>directly contradict</u> Catholicism's assertion that '<u>Mary remained</u> a virgin for her entire life'.

- 1. The Catholic Church makes the claim that there was not a distinct term in Aramaic for 'cousin' or 'non-immediate relative', so everyone was simply called a 'brother' or a 'sister', even if they were part of the extended family, not the immediate family. If this is true, why does Luke 1.36 say that the Angel Gabriel told Mary "Now indeed, Elizabeth your Cousin has also conceived a son."? When comparing Luke 1.36 to Matthew 13.55& 56 (which is the next quote), it becomes clear that there was a distinct term for 'a relative in the immediate family (i.e., brother or sister)', as well as another distinct term for 'a relative in the extended family (i.e., cousin)'. Think about it. By Catholicism's reasoning that everyone was simply called a 'brother' or a 'sister' would Luke 1.36 not have said 'Elizabeth your sister'? But Luke 1.36 clearly makes the distinction that Elizabeth was a cousin, not a sister.
- 2. <u>Matthew 13.55& 56</u> says "Is this not the carpenter's Son? Is not His mother called Mary? And <u>His brothers James, Joses, Simon, and Judas</u>? And <u>His sisters</u>, are they not all with us?" And so just as in Luke 1.36, if these 'brothers and sisters' were <u>not</u> Mary's children, then the quote <u>would have</u> read, 'His **cousins** (or relatives) James, Joses, Simon, and Judas'. I.e., at the very least, this quote would have put these 'brothers and sisters' on the <u>same level</u> as Elizabeth, calling them 'cousins' or 'relatives', if that is what they <u>truly</u> were. And so it becomes clear that these 'brothers and sisters' in Matthew 13.55&56 are indeed 'biological brothers and sisters'. As a note, consider that Catholicism, going to any length to <u>validate</u> their twisted web of lies, will in this case **insist** that these must be 'figurative brothers and

<u>sisters'</u>, yet Jesus could <u>not</u> possibly be 'a <u>figurative eunuch</u> that produced no godly offspring, not yet being <u>figuratively married</u> to <u>His bride'</u>, or that Jesus only **figuratively** meant things like 'This is body'. Essentially, the Catholic hierarchy picks and chooses, 'at their own will', quotes that will either be **figurative** or **literal**, with the primary motivation of <u>proudly</u> propagating their own glory, authority, and false enlightenment.

- 3. Mark 3.32-35 says "They said (to Jesus), 'Look Your mother and Your <u>brothers</u> and Your <u>sisters</u> are outside seeking You'. Jesus replied, 'For whoever does the will of God is My brother, and My sister and mother'". Here Jesus makes a <u>distinction</u> between 'people who are <u>biologically related to Him'</u>. The significance is that, even 'the people who are <u>not</u> biologically related to Jesus' will be <u>just like</u> 'His biologically related brothers, sisters, and mother', if they do the will of God. Think about it. If they were <u>not</u> His biologically related brothers and sisters, Jesus' assertion that 'anyone doing the will of God is <u>like</u> His brother, sister, or mother' would <u>not</u> have carried much weight. And so Jesus was trying to draw a <u>parallel</u> between 'the <u>perceived</u> closeness of His <u>immediate</u>, <u>biological</u> family', and 'the closeness of <u>all</u> the <u>non-biologically related people</u> who truly serve God'; noting that <u>Jesus'</u> own family <u>did not believe</u> Him (see Matthew 13.57 and John 7.5), therefore Jesus was actually closer to those <u>not</u> biologically related to Him.
- 4. John 7.5 says "For even His (Jesus') brothers did not believe Him". The Catholic Church claims that every time Jesus said 'brothers' He meant 'disciples', or vice versa. I.e., the Catholic Church asserts that these terms were used **interchangeably**. So how can we make a **distinction** between 'a brother that is a disciple' and 'a brother that is biologically related'? Just before this quote in John 6.69, Peter, Jesus' disciple, says "Also we have come to believe and know that You are the Christ". If Jesus' 'disciple brothers' just said that they believed Him in John 6.69, then Who are 'the brothers' most likely to not believe Jesus, immediately following in John 7.5? Jesus' 'biological brothers' that He grew up with and knew His whole life are 'the brothers' most likely to NOt believe Him. Besides, nothing special ever happened for 30 years, so why would that all suddenly change? Would not a biological brother be the first to say 'Our brother could not have been chosen by God'? As Jesus says in Matthew 13.57, "A prophet is respected everywhere except in his hometown and by his own family". Thus, it is obvious that Jesus' own family, His biological brothers, did not believe Him. Imagine if your biological Brother told you that He was 'the Messiah'. Would you believe Him? Probably not. So you can imagine what Jesus' biological brothers must have thought... obvious disbelief. Also note that, in this same context, Peter is not referred to as a 'brother'. And, John 7.3 says 'Jesus' brothers wanted Him to show all of His <u>disciples</u> the great work that He was doing', clearly making the distinction, in one line, between 'brother and disciple'; of course meaning that these words were not used interchangeably. Also note that 'the brothers in John 7.5' were from Galilee, which we can assume meant the vicinity of Nazareth, Jesus' hometown where His biological brothers would have lived.
- 5. <u>Galatians 1.19</u> says "But I saw none of the other <u>Apostles except James</u>, the <u>Lord's brother</u>"; noting also that *James* is mentioned along side of Jesus' other biological brothers and sisters in Matthew

13.55&56. Again, in this <u>one line</u> we can see that Paul is making the <u>distinction</u> between an Apostle (i.e., 'disciple brother') and a 'biological brother'. Think about it. Why say <u>both terms</u> unless Paul was trying to convey that <u>James was both</u> a 'biological brother' and a 'disciple brother'? By Catholic interpretation and reasoning it's <u>as if</u> Paul <u>redundantly</u> said 'But I saw none of the other <u>disciple brothers</u> except James, the Lord's <u>disciple brother</u>'; which <u>doesn't</u> make much <u>sense</u>. Furthermore, <u>John 2.12</u> says "After this (Jesus) went down to Capernaum, He, His mother, <u>His brothers</u>, and <u>His disciples</u>". Again, if 'brothers' always meant 'disciples', then <u>Why</u> use <u>both terms</u> in <u>one</u> 'singular' verse, making a distinction between the two? Why not use 'one term' or 'the other' if both of these terms were used interchangeably as the Catholic Church has asserted? The fact is that <u>these terms were not used interchangeably</u> because they meant two <u>different</u> specific groups of people: 'biological brothers of Jesus' and 'followers (i.e., disciples) of Jesus'. And, as seen in Galatians 1.19, if one of Jesus' biological brothers happened to <u>also</u> be a disciple, then they actually used <u>both terms</u> in describing that person; in this case James.

6. <u>Matthew 1.25</u> says "And <u>(Joseph) did not know her (Mary) until she had brought forth her firstborn</u>
<u>Son</u>". This one line tells us <u>2</u> key pieces of information. <u>1</u>st, after Mary's *first* Son, Joseph '<u>knew her'</u> in a <u>sexual context</u>. I.e., he was obviously already well acquainted with her, so '<u>know'</u> in this passage is 'to <u>know sexually</u>'; noting that the term '<u>know'</u> has been used to mean '<u>sexual intercourse'</u> from the time of Adam and Eve (see Genesis 4.1). Thus, <u>this verse directly states</u> that <u>Joseph had sexual intercourse</u> with Mary. <u>2</u>nd, by stating that Jesus was Mary's <u>firstborn</u> Son, this verse implies that there was at least a **second son** conceived by **sexual intercourse** with Joseph.

Thus, Mary was **not** a perpetual virgin as the Catholic hierarchy and their forefathers have falsely asserted, and they have **no proof** other than the **false prophets** of their own religion who lived **after** Jesus and Mary both left this earth. Therefore, **'the Mary'** that today's world knows, just like **'the Jesus'** of today's world, is a **total fabrication** from **'the minds of men'**; i.e., it is a **false Mary**. And with this **'sexually sterilized false Mary'**, the Catholic hierarchy has **redefined human sexual purity**, making **'what is right wrong'** and **'what is wrong right'**, thereby causing countless generations to live in unrighteous desolation about their sexuality; i.e., **'an unrighteous prison** of **sexual guilt and shame'**.

In addition to the Catholic Church's assertion that Mary was a perpetual virgin, they also assert that it is 'right and normal' to pray to Mary, another human being, in order for her to 'talk to God for us'; i.e., 'for her intercession'. This quite simply breaks the New Covenant by placing Mary as a false, unnecessary mediator between man and God; as Jesus is the sole Mediator of the New Covenant. And so to pray to Mary is not right or normal; it is highly abnormal, and part of the Catholic Church's poisoned inheritance or 'ancestral sin'. Besides, 'the Mary that everyone prays to' does not even exist as it is a fabrication of Catholicism - therefore realizing that 'praying to Catholicism's false Mary' is essentially like 'praying to Satan himself', as praying to their false Mary propagates Catholicism's supremacy and exclusion that ultimately causes 'division, war, and hate'. And so the Catholic hierarchy 'dresses up' their defilement of the New Covenant with words like 'We venerate Mary so that she will intercede for us with God'. But these words originate from the double mind of Satan. Venerate means

worship. It is simply another trick by Satan. Satan hides behind the innocence that we associate with Mary, and he sadistically plays on our human emotion and instinct that 'always wants a benevolent mother figure in heaven to help us'. Remember, Satan's deceptions are without boundaries. Therefore we must realize that, just like any false representation of Jesus, all of the statues and pictures of Mary are a **defilement** before God, and a defilement to the woman who actually lived 2000 years ago. Just like any idol, once a statue or image is worshiped by men, other men who are in control can place their own words in the mouth of that idol in order to maintain control and power. I.e., it is not so much 'the image that is a defilement', but 'the lies that accompany the image' that are the defilement. That's why false idols are so deceptively harmless in the eyes of humans: they don't realize the lies that false idols represent. Many lies have been told using Mary's name and image; many words have been said that she never said. In fact, Mary hardly appears in the Bible at all, hence most of the information about her has been falsely generated by Catholicism over the past 2000 years. And so we must not forget that Mary was a 'servant of God'; not God. Therefore, to venerate or worship Mary is the <u>same as</u> 'worshiping any other human on this earth'; realizing of course that 'worshipping Mary' could not even equate to 'worshipping God' anyway. I.e., since the true worship of God is simply 'loving others as ourselves', saying long prayers, such as the Rosary, would still not even constitute 'the true worship of God'. And - aside from blatantly breaking the 1st Commandment by 'bowing down to' and serving false idols and false gods - to venerate or worship Mary (or Mary's image), as well as any 'supposed saint' of the Catholic Church, is totally contradictory to the meaning of the New Covenant (i.e., the <u>direct relationship</u> between man and God), and **also** <u>contradicts</u> Jesus' continued <u>message of</u> equality; which even includes His mother. We place Mary on a pedestal, but Jesus Himself placed her as an equal to anyone who does the will of God. As seen in the following quotes, Jesus' 'message of equality' applied even to His mother.

In Luke 8.20-21 "Someone said to Jesus, 'Your mother and brothers are standing outside and want to see you'. Jesus said to them all 'My mother and brothers are all who hear the word of God and obey it". In Luke 11.27-28 "A woman spoke up from the crowd and said to Jesus, 'Blessed is the woman who bore and nursed you!' But Jesus answered, 'Rather, how blessed are those who hear the word of God and obey it!". Without meaning any disrespect to Mary, it is Jesus' own words that correct the woman by saying that 'you will be just like My mother, and as blessed as My mother, if you hear the word of God and obey it'. I.e., anyone who 'hears the word of God and obeys it' is equal to Jesus' mother, Mary. And so Mary is neither better nor worse than anyone who obeys the word of God; or, we are all potentially equal to Mary. As 'the equality clause' in the New Covenant says, 'From the least to the greatest, we all know God equally, and are therefore all equal before God'. Again, the point of this is not to 'tear down' or disrespect a good woman. It is merely meant to identify inherited doctrine of the Catholic Church that is false. Thus, we must come to the realization that the Catholic hierarchy has altered the identity of Mary, and falsely made the veneration and worship of 'a person they have never met' a Substantial part of salvation, thereby breaking the New Covenant by placing a 'false Mary' (i.e., a false mediator) in a superior position that is between man and God; remembering that 'there is only one Mediator between man and God, the Man Christ Jesus' (1 Timothy 2.5). And of course, by

venerating and worshipping Mary (i.e., <u>not</u> keeping her **equal**), the Catholic hierarchy has been able to <u>easily</u> speak lies about Mary (from <u>behind pictures</u> and **statues** of Mary), hence <u>blindly</u> creating the 'sexually sterilized false Mary' that is used - and has been used for many centuries - to <u>imprison</u> the multitudes with unrighteous guilt and shame.

As far as Jesus, there is evidence that Mary Magdalene was His wife or companion. We must ask ourselves 'Why did Jesus appear first to Mary Magdalene upon rising from the dead?' (John 20.11-18). Think about it. If you had just come back from the dead, wouldn't you want to see the woman you loved? So just by this simple act, it seems that Jesus was obviously closer, and had more of a connection with Mary Magdalene than any of His other disciples. Furthermore, it is quite coincidental that the Gospel of Philip from the Nag Hammadi Scripture says "The companion of the Savior is Mary of Magdala. The Savior loved her more than all the disciples, and He kissed her often on the mouth" (Philip 63,30-64,9). And also "Three women always walked with the Master: Mary His mother, His sister, and Mary of Magdala, who was called His companion. For 'Mary' is the name of His sister, His mother, and His companion" (Philip 59,6-11). So with all of this evidence, how and why would the Catholic hierarchy make a definitive assertion as to the virginity of Jesus? And why does it matter anyway? It is as if Jesus would be thought of as defiled if He had sexual intercourse with a wife or companion.

Additionally, it should be noted that the Catholic Church has <u>cast Mary Magdalene as a whore and a</u> prostitute, but Scripture does not say that at all. It merely says that 'she had 7 demons removed from her' (Luke 8.2). First of all, just because Mary Magdalene was plagued by 7 demons, it does not mean that she even **sinned**; i.e., it may have been **because** she **did not** sin that Satan and his demons were attacking her. So all we really know is that Mary Magdalene was battling an unseen demonic force that was removed by Jesus. **Secondly**, why have Mary Magdalene's demons been classified by Catholicism as being of a 'sexual nature'? The Catholic hierarchy has read into the character of Mary Magdalene that, if she had 7 demons, she <u>must have been</u> an <u>unclean whore</u> or a <u>prostitute</u>... once again proving their predisposition to demonize sexuality, and once again redefining someone's persona, essentially fabricating a 'false Mary Magdalene'. We must ask, could the demons not have been in the form of ancestral sin - such as idolatrous practices - that she blindly inherited, realizing that 'idolaters' were referred to as 'harlots'? Why assume they were 'sexual demons'? And so the fact is that we are never told that Mary Magdalene did anything wrong, and we do not know the nature of her demons. Thus, by the Catholic hierarchy immediately assuming that Mary Magdalene's demons must have had something to do with <u>sexuality</u>, they <u>prove</u> the simple fact that <u>there is an **underlying sexual guilt**</u> **complex rooted deep within Catholic doctrine**. And this sexual guilt complex is of course the result of 'false, redefined, sexually sterilized personas' of Jesus, Mary, the Apostles, and other such figures of the New Testament; realizing that Catholicism implies that 'Mary Magdalene also became sexually sterilized <u>once</u> she met a sexually sterilized Jesus'.

Again, sexuality is primal to all humanity. The Catholic hierarchy has redefined sexual purity based on false representations of both Jesus and Mary; which is ultimately defamation of character. And they have made 'right wrong' and 'wrong right' (Isaiah 5.20) in terms of human sexuality, thus 'perverting our humanity'. By stripping Jesus and Mary of their sexuality (or sterilizing them), the Catholic hierarchy has thereby stripped away the essence of their humanity, and in fact made them 'inhuman'. I.e., by stripping away Jesus and Mary's sexuality, the Catholic hierarchy has made them 'less than human', NOT 'more than human'. Hence, Jesus and Mary have, in the defiled projection of the Catholic Church, lost a major part of their humanity, and subsequently their identities have been changed for 'the worse', not 'the better'. We must consider that, once the identities of Jesus and Mary were sterilized of their natural sexuality by the Catholic Forefathers, anything less than a sterilized sexual life for all future generations has been wrongly perceived as 'falling short of perfect'; as imperfections in our human character... as impurity. Again, our human sexuality is the way God programmed us. And it is the wicked deceitfulness of Satan to make us wrongly believe that, 'if we have any sexual ambition, then we must have fallen off of God's assembly line as being defective'.

Because the Catholic Church has falsely interpreted the sexuality of Jesus and Mary, the whole world has been put in a 'normalized prison of sexual quilt and condemnation'; an inhuman standard of sexual sterilization. Anything outside their defiled parameters of 'proper sex within the confines of Catholic marriage' is unacceptable. The Catholic hierarchy has judged anything outside their definition of 'proper sex' as impure, while it is really 'the unrighteous guilt, shame, and judgment projected by the Catholic hierarchy' - and subsequent internal and external conflicts - that is 'the true impurity'. Many people in the Catholic Church (as well as other strict religions) live in Satan's normalized sexual prison, believing that 'it is <u>right</u> for them <u>to be **spiritual beaten** by Satan</u> (disguised of course as God) for having any sexual ambition'. In turn, they have become quick to judge anyone who 'does not live with that same unrighteous strictness' as being wrong. It's as if they are angry at people who want or enjoy sex because they themselves have been told by <u>Satan</u> (disguised of course as God) that 'it is wrong to want or enjoy sex'. What these people must understand is that they have been tricked into judging others based on Satan's Sterilized false identities of Jesus and Mary, and the subsequent redefining of sexual purity based on those false identities. If we 'place our minds firmly in our hearts', then we will realize that our inherited Catholic judgments on sexuality are actually from Satan, not God. Again, it is 'the guilt, shame, and <u>iudament</u> projected on our sexuality by the Catholic hierarchy' - remembering that these things cause the external conflicts of violence, oppression, and desolation - that is the true impurity, not *sexuality* itself.

Pope Francis recently said (with his well trained **double tongue**) that 'young people should not be <u>afraid</u> to marry'. What he cannot see is that 'he and his institution' are the very reason Why young people are <u>afraid</u> to marry in the first place. Think about it. If a young couple gets married, and then it does not work out, the Catholic hierarchy will be standing right there, ready to judge, condemn, guilt, shame, and <u>label</u> them as 'damaged goods', doomed to a life of 'living in the shadows' due to 'what they falsely claim is righteous judgment'. Given this scenario, who in their right mind would want to get married? And so the Pope is blind in that it is 'him and the warped sexual doctrine of Catholicism' that has <u>scared</u>

people into staying unmarried. But we must remember that 'Catholicism's warped sexual doctrine on marriage and sexuality' is a product of their gross misinterpretation of Jesus' words. And whether they want to accept it or not, the Catholic hierarchy does not join people together in marriage as if they are God, or deliver God's judgment concerning different people's personal relationships. That is, they are not the judge of what is 'righteous or unrighteous' within human sexuality, marriage, and personal relationships. Remember, 'God's law of judgment' dictates that all of the people who have deviated from the defined Catholic sexual norm 'will not be judged if they do not judge others'. But, by condemning all of the 'supposed sexual deviants' (i.e., people who are remarried without an annulment, people having premarital sex, homosexuals, people having abortions, people using contraception and in vitro fertilization, etc.), the Catholic hierarchy may as well be condemning themselves to the same judgment that they have rendered. That is, God's true judgment dictates that 'you will be condemned for that which you condemn others for' (Romans 2.1). Or, you will retain the sins of others if you judge and condemn them (John 20.23). Hence, the Catholic hierarchy will retain the same sexual judgment and condemnation for themselves that they have passed on others; noting that the Catholic hierarchy ultimately plays the <a href="https://example.com/https://example. as they left God long ago to 'fornicate with Satan'. It is important to recognize that the Catholic hierarchy will pretend to be innocent by saying 'We pass judgment on no one'. Do not believe their double tongue lie. Their doctrine passes judgment on everyone, and they are the bearers of that doctrine. The Catholic hierarchy cannot claim to be leaders of the Catholic Church, and then separate themselves from Catholic doctrine and judgment when it's convenient to avoid confrontation. The fact is that they are responsible for judging and condemning innocent people, yet they blindly think that they are serving God (John 16.2). Consequently, the Catholic hierarchy (as 'blind leaders of the blind') is blindly and unknowingly doing 'what they claim they could never do'... condemn and crucify an innocent Man over and over again 'in the form of' condemning and judging people's sexuality and personal relationships.

And so because of the Catholic Church's <u>degenerative</u>, inherited doctrine concerning the *redefined* sexuality of Jesus and Mary, they have blindly and unknowingly done the will of Satan by condemning countless innocent people to their 'prison of sexual guilt and judgment'. Satan has masterfully changed 'right into wrong' and 'wrong into right' so that the Catholic leaders blindly tell people who are 'sexually well', that they are 'sexually sick' (noting that these terms are pertaining to people's 'mindsets' concerning sexuality, not physical ailments). They blindly say that they need to 'pastor to' or 'shepherd' their people, as if they are 'physicians offering a cure'; as if they are 'doctors healing the sick'. But, the fact is that Satan has played the most devious of all mind manipulation games by convincing 'sexually sick' religious leaders to brainwash the 'sexually well' multitudes of people into thinking that they are really 'the ones who are sick'; when the whole time it has actually been the religious leaders who are 'the ones who are sexually sick', and thus guilty of spreading Satan's foul disease. Therefore, we must realize that Jesus is the one and only Physician who can heal the 'spiritual, emotional, and mental wounds' that Satan's servants (our religious leaders) have inflicted on humanity. Jesus is the only Liberator who can break down the walls of 'the Catholic Church's prison of sexual guilt and judgment'. Once Satan's sadistic lies are exposed by the Dawn of Jesus' return, liberty will be proclaimed to all of

those held captive (Luke 4.18), and there will be an **exodus from bondage** like the world has **never seen**; far greater than that of Moses and the Israelites out of the land of Egypt.

17. Sexual Imagery used in the Bible to Describe Idolatry

The Bible is coded so that the religious leaders cannot interpret what is written right in front of their eyes. They take all of the 'sexual words' like nakedness, lust, lewdness, fornication, adultery, and harlot at 'face value'. That is, they interpret these words literally, when they are actually figurative, drawing parallels between 'the natural attraction a man has to a woman' (i.e., lust), and 'the unnatural attraction a man has to money, glory, control, power, authority, and supremacy'. Hence, these 'words of sexual imagery' are all written about people (considered 'God's bride') who, by <u>lusting</u> after control and power, figuratively fornicated with Satan, thereby committing adultery against God (or with Satan); remembering that it is this 'macro level adultery' - i.e., man's lust or attraction to money, glory, control, power, authority, and supremacy - which is 'the cause of violence and oppression' (see Malachi 2.16). But since the religious leaders are spiritually blind and can't read the true meaning of these words, they cannot conceive that these words are actually written about them. That is, OUr blind religious leaders are 'the fornicators' using the Bible for control and power, so they cannot 'see' that the word 'fornicator' is referring to 'someone seeking control and power'; not 'someone who is overly indulgent in sexual activity'. Remember, <u>Sex</u> is of <u>God</u> (or of the *natural world*), while <u>control</u> and power is of man and Satan, realizing of course that, since <u>lust for control and power</u> causes violence and oppression, then these are the true impurities before God, not lust for sex. To reiterate this, recall that, when Satan tempted Jesus in the desert, he tempted with 'the control and power of nations', not sex. And so we must wonder, do the religious leaders not think that God is smart enough to 'cloak His words', when they, as mere humans, are smart enough to cloak their hidden desires for control, power, and the enslavement of their fellow man with 'false words of liberty and freedom'? Think about it. If God did not cloak or code His words, the people in power would have destroyed them long ago; also noting that, by coding their words, people such as Jesus would avoid immediate arrest, as 'going against <u>religious leaders'</u> also meant 'going against <u>the state</u>' in a time when there was '<u>no</u> separation of church and state', as we take for granted in modern day America. Thus by cloaking or coding His words, God has been secretly gathering the hidden kings (i.e., our religious leaders) together to be **overcome** by the Lamb at the Battle of Armageddon.

So we must come to understand that the <u>most misinterpreted</u> language in the Bible is <u>sexual</u> <u>terminology</u> such as *'lust, lewdness, fornication, adultery,* and *harlot'*. Jesus and the Prophets used these terms of <u>sexual imagery</u> almost exclusively to describe Israel and Judah's <u>idolatrous</u> practices. So <u>Jesus</u> and the <u>Prophets</u>, when they used these terms, <u>were <u>never</u> speaking on an <u>individual level</u>, but on <u>the level of nations</u>. I.e., they were speaking on a <u>macro</u> level, <u>not</u> a <u>micro</u> level (see Ezekiel chapter 23 in which Samaria and Jerusalem are given people's names, thereby <u>personifying 2 large</u> groups of people <u>as if</u> they are <u>actually</u> 2 <u>individual</u> sisters). Hence, the terminology that Jesus and the Prophets used was aimed at identifying a <u>large group</u> of people, such as an <u>entire nation</u>, who had walked after strange gods, thereby committing <u>adultery</u> against God. Remember that <u>adultery</u> is '<u>any</u> <u>broken relationship</u> or <u>agreement</u> <u>between two parties</u>', such as between 'two <u>businesses</u>', 'a corporation and its customers', 'two individuals', or as usually the case in the Bible, adultery was</u>

between 'God and His people'. In other words, adultery = unfaithfulness in a covenant or agreement. 'God's people', as a group, are considered 'His bride or wife', with 'God or Jesus' as 'the Bridegroom or Husband', and when His wife broke her agreement with God, she was considered an adulterer or harlot. Therefore, sexual imagery was used by Jesus and the Prophets in the hope of conveying 'the way that God feels' when 'His wife fornicates with Satan, thereby playing the harlot, and thus committing adultery against Him'. Imagine the rage and jealousy of a husband who had to watch his wife 'be with another man'. So we must realize, as we are made in God's image and similitude, that God's rage and jealousy is no different when He watches His people 'fornicate with' (i.e., worship) Satan and all of his false prophets, false gods, false idols, and man-made false covenants. Again, the sexual imagery used by Jesus and the Prophets figuratively conveys acts of idolatry (i.e., the worship of Satan), not literal acts of human sexuality.

Sexual imagery in the Bible draws <u>parallels</u> that *liken* <u>varying</u> relationships between 'man, woman, and child' <u>to varying</u> relationships between 'God, His people, rulers, religious leaders, false gods, or Satan'. So, in order to begin to understand the sexual imagery used in the Bible, it is important to know that these varying relationships 'paint metaphorical pictures' in <u>many different</u> ways. Some of those are as follows.

- A) 'God = Father', and 'we = children'; noting that Jesus is referred to as 'the Son of God'.
- B) 'God = Husband', and 'we = God's wife'. See Jeremiah 3.14 where God says 'I am married to the people Israel'; noting that, in this same verse, God refers to 'His wife' as also 'His children'.
- C) 'Jesus (i.e., God's human stand-in) = Husband or Bridegroom', and 'we = Jesus' wife or bride'. See Romans 7.4 where Paul says 'You are married to Christ'.
- D) 'A false prophet (i.e., Satan's human stand-in) = a false husband', and 'we = a harlot for figuratively fornicating with a false husband'. Note that this is the sexual imagery used in the Book of Revelation (see 17.2) where 'the hidden kings (i.e., our religious leaders or false prophets) fornicate with the harlot 'Babylon' (i.e., the hidden Roman Empire made up of the leaders of the world's governments)'. Also note that 'the 144,000 people who do not fornicate with the harlot' are referred to as 'virgins' in Revelation 14.4, and in a sense, will rule with Christ, following Him when He returns.
- E) 'A false prophetess (i.e., Satan's human stand-in) = a false wife', and 'we = an adulterous husband'. See Revelation 2.20-22 where Jezebel, a false prophetess, is referred to as 'the wife to a group of people'.
- F) 'Satan (or <u>any</u> of his false gods or false idols) = a false husband and false father', 'we = a harlot for figuratively fornicating with Satan' (noting that Exodus 34.16 says that 'both female daughters and <u>male sons</u> play the <u>harlot</u>'), and 'children of fornication (see John 8.41) or ungodly offspring = our descendents who inherit the <u>lies</u> based on our <u>adulterous</u> relationship or false marriage with Satan (or any of his false gods or false idols)'; noting that, in John 8.44, Jesus says that 'Satan is the father of these <u>children</u> of fornication (i.e., the Pharisees)'.

- G) 'We = husband', 'God's daughter (i.e., God's holy institution, covenant, or laws) = wife', and 'godly offspring = our descendents who inherit the <u>truth</u> based on our <u>marriage</u> with <u>God's</u> <u>daughter'</u>.
- H) 'We = husband', 'a false god's daughter (i.e., a false god's covenant, or a set of false manmade beliefs or laws) = wife', and 'ungodly offspring = our descendents who inherit the <u>lies</u> based on our adulterous relationship or <u>false marriage</u> with the <u>daughter of a false god'</u>. Note that both <u>G</u> and <u>H</u> were taken from Malachi 2.11-15 where 'Judah = husband', 'God's daughter (i.e., God's holy institution, covenant, or laws) = wife', and 'a foreign god's daughter (i.e., a false god's covenant) = a false wife or harlot'. Here Judah <u>divorced</u> God's covenant with the fathers (see Malachi 2.8&10) to <u>marry</u> the covenant or ways of 'people from a foreign land who worship a false god'; which will of course result in ungodly offspring (i.e., 'violent offspring' from Malachi 2.15&16).
- I) 'Jesus = Husband or Bridegroom', 'we = Jesus' wife or bride', and when Jesus returns to 'marry His wife' (see Revelation 19.7), this consummation (see Matthew 24.3) will produce godly offspring (see also Section 16) who follow and honor the true covenant or laws of God; that is, the New Covenant.

So as you can see, there are many different images created with sexuality, and depending on who is speaking, whether a Prophet or Jesus, our role in these metaphorical relationships changes from wife, to husband, to even child. Now this all may sound quite confusing to us in today's world, but if you lived at the time of the Prophets or Jesus, then you may have had an easier time understanding the language of the day. Consider that, in today's world, we use the terms ' \underline{cougar} ' and ' \underline{cub} ' where ' $\underline{cougar} = an$ older woman', and 'cub = a younger man'. While this relationship is sexual in nature, the metaphorical words *misleadingly* portray a <u>paternal relationship</u>. Imagine if someone 2000 years in the future read 'She was as a cougar, and he was as her cub'? Would they not read this metaphorical language totally wrong, making complete nonsense of the true meaning of the words? I.e., they would read this figurative language as being non-sexual, when in fact it is sexual. Conversely, we still use sexual terms and imagery such as A) 'They are in bed together' to mean 'They have a shady business relationship', B) 'She makes love to the camera' (i.e., 'She has figurative sex with the camera') to mean 'She is photogenic', C) 'He has a mistress' to mean 'He is not faithful to his primary job', D) 'She's married to her job' to mean 'She has no life outside of her job', and E) 'He's married to money' to mean 'He loves money, power, and control'. Hence, we must realize that all of these figurative 'sayings' use sexual language and imagery to describe something that is in fact non-sexual, just as is the case with most Biblical sexual imagery. Thus, we must realize that people have, for thousands of years, used metaphorical language with sexual imagery (just as the present day examples just listed) to convey ideas that are really **not sexual** at all. And we have, thousands of years in the **future**, made **COMPlete nonsense** of the true meaning of their words.

As mentioned in **Section 1**, **Violence** and **Oppression**, **not** sexuality, is the **true offense** to God. And violence and oppression are ultimately a product of people breaking their covenant or agreement with God; which is of course described as 'a marriage with sexual metaphors and imagery' in an attempt to make people *understand* the magnitude of pain that it causes God to see His people 'playing the harlot with other gods, idols, false prophets, Satan, etc'. This is why many times we see language pertaining to 'people being adulterous, idol worship, and violence/bloodshed' all in the same context. As an example, the Book of Nahum calls **Nineveh** 'a <u>bloody</u> city with a multitude of slain and <u>countless corpses</u>' (Nahum 3.1&3), with the very next verse (3.4) calling Nineveh 'a seductive harlot'; noting from Nahum 1.14 that 'Nineveh was full of false gods with carved and molded images (i.e., false idols)'. So we must understand that all of these <u>supposed literal</u> adulterers and <u>harlots</u> in the Old Testament were <u>not</u> 'people who loved having <u>literal, sexual intercourse</u>', but rather 'people who figuratively married false gods (i.e., a set of false man-made beliefs) with which they had figurative, spiritual intercourse'. And these metaphorical adulterous relationships ultimately *caused* bloodshed and violence; as all 'man-made gods and sets of belief' advocate, weather hidden or openly, some type of <u>caste system</u> and <u>supremacy</u>, which leads to enslavement and oppression, and eventually 'division, war, and hate'. Thus, most times in the Bible, adultery and fornication are used *figuratively* to mean idolatry. Therefore, many times adultery, fornication, and idol worship can be seen paired in the same context. Examine the following verses.

- 1. Revelation 2.20-22: "You allow your wife Jezebel, who calls herself a prophetess, to teach and seduce My servants to commit <u>fornication</u> and <u>eat things sacrificed to idols</u>. Indeed I will cast her into a sickbed, and those who commit <u>adultery</u> with her into great tribulation".
- 2. Acts 15.20: "Write to (the Gentiles) to abstain from things polluted by **idols**, from **fornication**, from things strangled, and from blood".
- 3. 1 Corinthians 10.7&8: "And do not become <u>idolaters</u> as were some of them (referring to the Israelite's <u>false idol</u>, 'the <u>golden calf</u>' in Exodus chapter 32). Nor let us commit <u>fornication</u>, as some of them did, and in one day 23,000 fell (noting that Exodus 32.28 says **only** 3000 fell)". Note also here that Exodus chapter 23 does <u>not</u> say the first thing about 'people having <u>literal</u> sexual intercourse', but is <u>solely</u> about 'the people <u>playing</u> the harlot with a <u>false idol</u>' (see 'the people rose up to <u>play</u>' in Exodus 32.6). So in 1 Corinthians 10.7&8, Paul is giving us the equation <u>idolater = fornicator</u>.
- 4. Ephesians 5.5: "For know this, that <u>no fornicator</u>, unclean person, nor covetous man, <u>who is an idolater</u>, has any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God"; noting here that Paul **again** essentially says '<u>a fornicator</u>' = '<u>an idolater</u>'. Also note that a 'covetous man' covets or lusts after the supremacy and authority of God; which in itself is idolatry by making 'you and your man-made set of false beliefs' into 'a false idol and false god'.

Therefore, we must recognize in these quotes, that *fornication* is referring to 'figurative fornication' in which we have 'spiritual intercourse', not 'sexual intercourse', with Satan or any of his false

gods, false idols, false prophets (i.e., husbands), false prophetesses (i.e., wives), false doctrine, or false covenants; noting that these terms are all somewhat <u>interchangeable</u>, as they <u>all</u> ultimately <u>equate to Satan</u>. So 'spiritual fornication' or 'spiritual intercourse' with Satan is 'the joining or marrying of your <u>spirit</u> with the <u>Spirit of Error</u>'; realizing that this joining or marriage is a <u>false marriage</u> - as it is <u>not</u> with the one true Bridegroom, Christ - and is thereby an <u>adulterous</u> relationship before God. Note that this is why Jesus says (in Matthew 24.38-39) with a <u>negative connotation</u> 'When the Son of Man returns, people will be <u>drinking</u> (i.e., getting 'drunk on power'), <u>marrying</u>, and <u>giving in marriage</u> to Satan, and any of his <u>false husbands</u> or <u>false wives</u>'. Hence, <u>adulterers</u> and <u>fornicators</u> were actually 'those who followed Satan in <u>any</u> one of his many forms'; which often involved idols and idol worship, making it obvious that these <u>adulterers</u> and <u>fornicators</u> were actually <u>idolaters</u> who engaged in <u>spiritual</u> intercourse with Satan. Again, 'an adulterer or fornicator' = 'an idolater'.

Examine Revelation 2.20-22. Remembering that the sexual imagery used in the Bible is usually speaking to a group of people on a macro level, notice that Jesus is addressing an entire church group: the church in Thyatira. He says "You allow your **wife** Jezebel, who calls herself a prophetess, to teach and seduce My servants to commit fornication and eat things sacrificed to idols. Indeed I will cast her into a sickbed, and those who commit adultery with her into great tribulation". To think that Jezebel is 'the wife of an entire group of people' does not make any sense. That is, are we to actually believe (according to Catholic **literal** interpretation) that Jezebel was 'having sex with an entire congregation', and even **teaching** them how to have sex? Therefore, if the words 'wife and fornication' are interpreted literally, then this verse turns into total nonsense. And so in actuality, Jezebel was teaching doctrine that was in accordance with Satan's laws or covenant, as if it was Christ's New Covenant. By doing so, she was essentially marrying herself to the people as a false wife (i.e., false prophetess), making the people of Thyatira commit adultery against God and Jesus; i.e., she was making them break their agreement (or covenant) with God, remembering that 'adultery' is essentially 'any broken agreement'. In other words, Jezebel was having 'spiritual intercourse' or 'figurative fornication' - not 'sexual intercourse' or 'literal fornication' - with the entire group of people in Thyatira, and we can say that she was effectively 'standing in the place of Satan'; although in this case, she was doing so as a 'woman' or 'wife', which is **different** than the more common terminology of 'a false prophet being a **false** husband who is not the true Husband, Christ'. And so to act as a 'figurative husband or wife' (most times implied 'false husband or wife') to an entire group of people is to actually become 'Satan's human stand-in'. Knowing that Jesus is 'God's human Stand-in', and the one true figurative Husband (i.e., Bridegroom, see Matthew 9.15), false prophets and false prophetesses are considered 'Satan's human stand-ins' and act as 'figurative false husbands or false wives' to entire groups of people. I.e., today people figuratively marry their priests, preachers, rabbis, imams, or swamis; all of which act as a false husband that is not Christ, the one true Husband or Bridegroom. Thus, we must realize that, just as Jesus referred to Himself figuratively as the Bridegroom - i.e., 'Husband-to-be', as Revelation 19.7 says that 'Jesus will not actually be married to His wife (i.e., humanity) until His return' - the terms 'husband and wife' were used to figuratively describe 'false prophets and false prophetesses that entire groups of people (i.e., Thyatira) would marry themselves to', thereby committing figurative fornication (i.e., spiritual intercourse), and consequently <u>figurative</u> adultery; noting again that this is why Jesus speaks <u>negatively</u> about 'people

<u>marrying</u> right before His return and the judgment of all the nations' (see Matthew 24.38), as these marriages are all 'false marriages with <u>Satan's human stand-ins</u>'.

One of the <u>most misunderstood</u> biblical encounters that uses the term 'husband' is 'the meeting of Jesus and the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well' (John 4.1-30). The true meaning of this encounter is <u>SO</u> <u>much more profound</u> than most people are even aware of. Most interpretations of this episode inaccurately paint the picture of 'a sexually promiscuous woman who is shocked because Jesus, a Jew, is conversing with her, a <u>Samaritan</u>'. But again, this episode has nothing to do with '<u>literal</u> sexuality, adultery, or marriage between a man and a woman'. Remember, the <u>Samaritans</u> had a <u>long history of worshiping false idols on Mount Gerizim</u>, and creating their own 'counterfeit' version of Judaism where King Jeroboam made two golden calves and his own man-made religion, '<u>Samaritanism</u>' (see 1 Kings 12.27-33). And so - noting that the <u>context</u> of this encounter (<u>John 3.29</u>) calls Jesus '<u>the figurative true</u> <u>Husband</u>' - the essence of this encounter is to let the woman know that she has <u>figuratively married herself</u> to men who are <u>false prophets</u> (presumed to be Samaritan priests) or <u>figurative false husbands</u>, while in all likelihood she was raised to <u>believe</u> that these men were <u>true</u> Prophets and spoke the truth of God. Therefore, contrary to what many have been taught, this encounter is <u>not</u> about a Samaritan woman who <u>literally</u> gets <u>married to 5 different men</u>. This encounter from John 4.16-23 is as follows.

"Jesus said to her, 'Go, call your <u>husband</u>, and come here'. The woman answered and said, 'I have <u>no husband</u>'. Jesus said to her, 'You have well said (that you have no husband), for you have had <u>five husbands</u>, and <u>the one</u> whom you <u>now have is not your husband</u>; in that you spoke truly'. The woman said to Jesus, 'Sir, I perceive that You are a <u>prophet</u>. <u>Our (Samaritan) fathers worshiped on this mountain (i.e., Mount Gerizim)</u>, and you <u>Jews</u> say that in <u>Jerusalem is the place where one ought to worship'</u>. Jesus said to her, 'Woman, believe Me, the hour is coming when you will <u>neither</u> on this <u>mountain</u>, <u>nor in Jerusalem</u>, <u>worship the Father</u>. You worship <u>what you do not know</u>; we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews. But the hour is coming, and now is, when the <u>true worshipers</u> will worship the Father in spirit and truth.""

The first clue that Jesus and the Samaritan woman are **not** conversing about 'literal marriage and adultery on an individual level between a man and a woman' is made evident by the woman's response. Jesus tells the woman that she has had 5 husbands (plus one), and her immediate response is to state that 'Jesus is a Prophet', followed by stating 'where the Samaritans worship', and 'where the Jews worship'. Think about it. This reply does not make any sense in context if 'husband' is interpreted literally. So by the woman immediately saying 'Jesus is a Prophet', it will become evident that she was actually defining their term for a prophet; i.e., prophet = figurative husband. The Samaritans were considered pagans by the Jews because they sacrificed to idols on Mount Gerizim, while the Jews believed (as it was not true worship either) that they followed the Law of Moses and practiced true worship at the temple in Jerusalem. That's why Jesus says to the woman "You worship what you do not know"; they followed a false man-made set of laws (i.e., Samaritanism) that were not God's laws. By saying that she had '5+ husbands', Jesus is stating that the woman had followed (maybe over the course of her lifetime) the teaching of at least 5 false prophets of the religion 'Samaritanism'. Hence, the

Samaritan woman had figuratively committed adultery by divorcing God and figuratively remarrying these false prophets - or **figurative false husbands** - who were in fact 'human stand-ins' for Satan; realizing of course, as she was probably born into Samaritanism, that she believed these false prophets truly spoke for God, and consequently that she was truly married to God. But in fact, these false prophets were false husbands, and Jesus was able to state with absolute certainty that 'the one whom you now have is **not** your husband', because - remembering of course that, only a **few verses** previous to this in **John 3.29**, Jesus is referred to as 'the figurative true **Bridegroom**', or **Husband** - her 'true Husband', Jesus, was standing right in front of her. I.e., Jesus was actually the Samaritan woman's one true figurative Husband (i.e., Bridegroom) and the true Prophet who is 'God's only human stand-in'. The main idea of this entire episode is that 'because of all of these false husbands and false wives, God (the true Husband) was going to <u>do away with religion</u> and <u>worship rituals</u> (which of course took place on Mount Gerizim and in Jerusalem) in order to seal a New Covenant in which each individual person worshipped God independently in spirit and truth'; which is essentially just 'loving one another'. Unfortunately, this 'earth shattering', revolutionary idea has always been overshadowed by false interpretations about the Samaritan woman's sexuality; who more than likely was never even literally married, as she was answering literally that 'she had no husband', yet Jesus was speaking to her figuratively, which she finally realized when Jesus insisted that 'she had been married'. Note that, if you don't think this was the case, then consider that, in the previous verses (John 4.10-15), the woman was speaking about <u>literal water</u> from the well, yet Jesus was responding to her by speaking about <u>figurative</u> living water; remembering that Jesus does the same when responding figuratively to 'the Pharisees question about literal divorce' in Matthew 19.3-10. So again, this whole encounter with 'the Samaritan woman at the well' is ultimately about **idolatry**, or <u>figurative false marriages</u> with Satan's <u>false</u> husbands that result in figurative adultery between 'man and God', not literal adultery between 'man and woman'. To reiterate, **husband** in this context is a *figurative husband* or *prophet*, as this ('Sir, I perceive that You are a prophet') is the woman's immediate response after being asked about 'her husband'.

Pharisees wanted to stone' in John 8.1-12. It is widely accepted that this adulteress was 'caught in the act of having literal sex'. But the Bible only says "Teacher, this woman was caught in adultery, in the very act" (verse 4). And so we must ask ourselves, 'If she was caught in the act of having sex, why did they not detain the man who she was having sex with? Is he not also guilty of adultery?' Again, if we examine the surrounding context, this does not make any sense, just as with the Samaritan woman and her supposed 5 literal husbands. Therefore, since there are no other details given, we must again assume that this adultery is figurative adultery between 'man (in this case woman) and God', as it would be impossible for a woman to commit literal adultery Without a man present. Also, it is fair to assume that 'the very act' that this woman was 'caught in' must have been 'the act of sacrificing to an idol', recalling Revelation 2.20-22 where 'Jezebel teaches the people to commit figurative fornication and adultery by eating things sacrificed to idols'. Hence, this 'sacrificing to an idol' is 'the sin' that Jesus says to 'not do any more' in verse 11. Furthermore, if we interpret that this entire episode is speaking literally about 'a woman having sex', then Jesus' final culminating line does not seem to make

much sense; or at the very least, it is rather vague and nondescript. In verse 12 (the final culminating line) Jesus says, "I am the **light** of the world. He who follows Me shall not walk in **darkness**, but have the light of life". Think about it. Why would Jesus not conclude by giving some sort of commentary **chastising** the <u>woman's sexual behavior</u> if that was really <u>why</u> she was reprimanded by the Pharisees in the first place? The point is that this adulteress was 'caught in the act of worshiping a false idol', and that's why there is **no** dissertation from Jesus regarding 'proper sexual behavior'. Remember, one of the most deceptively harmless aspects of worshiping false idols is that 'it is not so much the idol that is a defilement to God, but rather the <u>lies</u> that are told <u>in His name</u> which <u>accompany the idol</u>". The <u>lies</u> are the defilement to God, the <u>lies</u> are the cause of *ancestral sin*, and the <u>lies</u> are 'the darkness'. The adulteress was 'a blind slave to her inherited lies' who was therefore 'walking in darkness', just like the Scribes and the Pharisees; this of course making the Scribes and Pharisees 'blind hypocrite adulterers', wanting to stone someone else for something they themselves were also guilty of. Thus, they were all 'walking in the darkness of their ancestral sin', and Jesus (in verse 12) was trying to tell them that 'He was the **light** and the **truth** that would **set them free** from the slavery of their ancestral sin (i.e., inherited lies) which kept them in darkness'. As Jesus says a few verses later in verse 32, 'My truth shall set you free'. So again, the adultery in this account is figurative adultery between 'man and God' (i.e., 'man committing adultery with Satan' or 'man committing adultery against God'), not literal adultery between 'man and woman'.

Now that we can recognize the **figurative** sexual language that is used in the Bible to convey **idolatrous** behavior - i.e., 'adultery on a macro level in terms of God and man' - examine the **following examples** (some of which have **already** been discussed in this book), recognizing of course that these examples are **not** referring to **individual**, **literal** relationships or marriages, but **macro level**, **figurative** relationships or marriages.

1. "Now the **body** is not for fornication, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body. Do you not know that your (human) bodies are <u>members of Christ's (body</u> of believers)? Shall I then take the <u>members of Christ</u> and make them <u>members of a **harlot**</u>? Certainly not!" (1 Corinthians 6.13&15). Recall that **Ephesians** 5.30-32 says "For we are members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones (verse 30). For this reason a <u>man</u> shall leave his father and mother and be <u>joined</u> to his <u>wife</u>, and <u>the two shall become one flesh</u> (verse 31). This is a great mystery, but <u>I speak CONCErNING Christ</u> and the church (verse 32)". So Ephesians 5.30-32 makes it clear that figuratively 'Christ = the man', and 'the church or the members of Christ's body of people (not including Christ) = the wife'. Hence, it becomes obvious that 1 Corinthians 6.13&15 is speaking about 'the <u>members</u> of Christ's **body** of people (or His wife) **figuratively** fornicating (i.e., having spiritual intercourse) with Satan (or any of his false husbands or wives), thereby (as a whole) acting as a harlot' (just as the harlot 'Babylon' in Revelation, and 'Ephraim' in Hosea 4.17-18). And by this verse saying 'the <u>body</u> is for the Lord', Paul means that 'the <u>members</u> of the church, acting as a figurative wife, are ONLY to have spiritual intercourse with Christ, and no other (false) husband'. Also note that, in this same context (1 Corinthians 6.16), Paul uses the exact terminology as he did in Ephesians 5.31 - 'the two shall become one flesh' - again pointing to the fact that this is a macro level figurative marriage between 'Christ and his people'; i.e., 'God and man', not 'man and woman'.

2. "And I (Jesus) say to you, whoever divorces his wife, except for fornication, and marries another, commits adultery; and whoever marries her who is divorced commits adultery" (Matthew 19.9). This is discussed in Section 16, yet to reiterate, Matthew 19.5 (the setup for Matthew 19.9) and Ephesians 5.31 (as noted in the previous quote) are identical, again meaning that 'Christ = the man', and 'the church or the members of Christ's body of people (not including Christ) = the wife', and consequently that Matthew 19.9 is speaking about macro level figurative marriage. And so on a macro level, Matthew 19.9 translates as 'If it wasn't for Christ's wife (i.e., His body of people in Israel and Judah) committing fornication, it would be unlawful (i.e., adulterous) for Him to divorce her (see Jeremiah 3.8) and marry another wife (or body of people). Nonetheless, Israel and Judah has only one true Husband, so whoever (speaking specifically about Satan and all of his human stand-ins) marries themselves to Jesus' divorced wife (i.e., Israel or Judah) is guilty of committing adultery against God/Jesus'; realizing of course that it is implied here that God/Jesus has more than one wife. Note that this is reiterated in both Ezekiel chapter 23 and in 'The Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins' where Jesus, the one true Husband or Bridegroom, returns at the End of the Age and 'takes 5 virgins out of the 10 virgins as His wives' (see Matthew 25.1-13).

Furthermore, it should be recognized that <u>Luke 16.18</u> is an almost identical verse to <u>Matthew 19.9</u>, yet in Luke, Jesus seems to say this line - if this line is interpreted literally - 'out of the blue' or 'out of context'. In Luke 16.1-13 Jesus tells an entire parable about 'The Unjust Steward', which pertains to man's 'love affair' with mammon: 'material wealth having a corrupting influence'. I.e., mammon = money, power, control, authority, and glory. Then verse <u>14</u> reiterates that 'the Pharisees loved money, as if married to money', with verse 15 essentially saying that 'Their love of mammon, which of course was justified with the name of God, was an **abomination** in the sight of God'. Now we must ask ourselves, with all of this Set-up in which Jesus is speaking about 'man's love affair with money', are we to **believe** that Luke 16.**18** - "Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery; and whoever marries her who is divorced from her husband commits adultery"- is actually pertaining to 'adultery between man and woman'? Think about it. Jesus even tells another story pertaining to 'man's love affair with money' (i.e., the story of 'The Rich Man and Lazarus') immediately after Luke 16.18, starting with verse 19. And so the fact is that, it is ignorant of our religious leaders - as if they are 3rd graders who cannot identify the 'context clues' - to interpret Luke 16.18 as being about 'literal adultery between a man and a woman'; especially when you consider that Jesus continually quoted the Prophets who spoke repeatedly about 'macro, figurative adultery between God and the nations of Israel and Judah'. Ultimately 'mammon = Satan, or the doctrine of Satan', and as Jesus says in Luke 16.13, 'You cannot <u>serve</u> (i.e., <u>be married to</u>) <u>both</u> God and mammon (i.e., Satan), as you will be <u>loyal</u> (or <u>'faithful'</u>, which is used 4 times in this context) and hate the other'. That is, if you love money, power, control, authority, and glory, it doesn't matter how often you say 'I love God' (just as the Pharisees did), you actually hate God, being of course blindly married to Satan. Thus, Luke 16.18 (just as Matthew 19.9) is speaking about the Pharisees (i.e., Satan's human stand-ins, or figurative false husbands) who marry themselves to Jesus' wife, thereby corrupting the multitudes with the doctrine of Satan (i.e., the doctrine of 'the love of mammon'), as they themselves are 'figuratively married to mammon' (in this role as a wife). Remember, we still figuratively say in today's world 'He is married to money' as if

'money is his <u>spouse</u>', so we should not be so naïve as to think that they did not use the <u>same</u> figurative language 2000 years ago.

- 3. Remembering from the beginning of this Section that the **sexual imagery** in the Bible is presented in many different ways with different people playing different roles in the imagery, Paul says the following from 1 Corinthians 4.15. "For though you might have 10,000 instructors in Christ, yet you (the people of the church of Corinth) do **not** have many **fathers**; for in Christ Jesus I (Paul) have **begotten** you through the **gospel**." So **similar** to 'G' of 'the many different types of sexual imagery discussed earlier in this Section', here 'Paul = husband/father', 'the gospel = wife/mother', and 'the church or body of people at Corinth = godly offspring'. Yet in 1 Corinthians 5.1 it says that "There is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not even among the Gentiles - that a **man** has **his father's wife!"** So knowing that Paul just said that 'he was the Corinthian's figurative father', it is obvious that a false figurative husband (i.e., a religious leader) has distorted the teachings of Christ, which will of course lead to ungodly offspring. That is, a 'child' of the church of Corinth took his father's (i.e., Paul's) wife, and defiled her; 'her' being 'Paul's figurative wife', 'the true doctrine or gospel of Christ'. This is further verified in 1 Corinthians 5.7 when Paul says 'Purge out the old leaven, since you truly are unleavened', which as noted in Matthew 16.6-12, 'leaven' is 'the false doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees that leads to pride, vanity, and supremacy'; understanding the parallel that 'leavening makes bread puff up', just as 'the false doctrine of Satan makes people puff up with pride'. As Paul says in the very next line (verse 2) after 1 Corinthians 5.1 (i.e., 'a man has his father's wife'), 'You are puffed up'. Thus, Paul is not speaking <u>literally</u> here about 'an individual having <u>literal sexual intercourse</u> with his mother', but figuratively about 'a false teacher (as Paul notes 10,000 teachers in 1 Corinthians 4.15) defiling the true doctrine of Christ'; see also Galatians 1.7 which speaks about 'some who trouble you, and want to pervert or **defile** the gospel of Christ'.
- 4. As already discussed in **Section 2**, **Matthew 5.27-30** is not speaking **literally** about 'lusting after a woman, thereby committing <u>literal adultery</u>', but rather figuratively about 'false husbands (i.e., false prophets or false teachers) lusting after or **coveting** the true Husband's wife (i.e., God's people, which, in this context, is usually Israel or Judah), thereby committing figurative adultery'. And these false husbands are likened to 'an eye or a hand of the human body' (note that they use 'an eye' to figuratively represent 'a visionary') that should be plucked out or cut off so that they do not corrupt the entire body; with of course the 'human body' being compared or likened to 'Christ's body of believers'. As a side note that reiterates this imagery, Paul also says in Galatians 4.15 "You would have plucked out your own eyes and given them (i.e., people) to me", with verse 17 verifying that 'these eyes' = 'false husbands' who "Zealously COUrt you (for figurative marriage), but for no good" (Galatians 4.17). Furthermore, it must be noted that Paul, 2 verses later in Galatians 4.19, again changes the role of the Galatians from being 'his wife' to being 'his children'. I.e., after alluding that 'the Galatians are figuratively married to him' in Galatians 4.15-17, Paul figuratively says in Galatians 4.19 "My little children (the Galatians), for whom <u>I labor in birth</u>"; realizing of course that Paul is obviously not 'a woman in literal labor'. Also note that this talk of 'courting (or marriage) by false husbands' is in the context of idolatry, with Paul in Galatians 4.8&9 saying that 'The Galatians were turning back to their

old ways of serving false gods', no doubt at the direction of their 'eyes' (i.e., false prophets or false teachers). Now getting back to Matthew chapter 5, Jesus in verse 32 again says an almost identical verse to the previously mentioned Matthew 19.9 and Luke 16.18 in which the religious leaders (i.e., the Pharisees) were acting as *false <u>figurative</u> husbands*, marrying themselves to (or at least <u>lusting</u> after) Jesus' divorced wife, thereby committing figurative adultery. Now again it is important to pay attention to what else is in the context of 'the previous verses (i.e., Matthew 5.27-32) which pertain to adultery'. If verses <u>27-32</u> are indeed speaking about '<u>literal</u> marriage and adultery between a man and woman', then why does Jesus immediately say in the following verses 33&34 'Do not swear any oaths at all to God'? Is not 'marriage between a man and a woman' actually 'an oath sworn to God'? That is, are not 'marriage vows' actually 'marriage oaths'? So, if verses 27-32 are taken literally, then Jesus directly contradicts Himself in the very next verses 33&34. So the fact is that, verses 27-32 do not contradict verses 33&34, as verses 27-32 are speaking, in some respects, about 'the cause of sinning being figurative marriage oaths that are sworn blindly and unknowingly to Satan and his false husbands', with of course those false husbands (i.e., false prophets, false teachers, false mediators, etc.) blindly swearing oaths 'to Satan and by his lies'... all while thinking they are swearing oaths 'to God and by His truth'. To clarify this idea of 'swearing oaths', consider that, when men start swearing oaths (i.e., swearing 'this or that is **absolutely** and **infallibly** the truth') they become 'bound to that oath', then, being <u>rigid</u> and <u>inflexible</u> in their thinking, become 'bound to <u>protect</u> that oath' when they find out that 'what they SWORE was the truth', is actually false. I.e., they place fig leaves (see Section 1) over their figurative nakedness (i.e., ignorance), protecting their lies out of 'pride for the oath and office it represents, **pride** for themselves, and **pride** for the community of people who swore the oath with them'. These are the **lies** that are responsible for 'the **creation** of **false gods**' or 'false man-made belief systems' that people (in the future) then blindly follow and 'swear by', thinking that they are 'swearing by the <u>truth</u>'. So the <u>swearing of oaths</u> (or swearing that 'this is absolutely and infallibly the truth') leads to the <u>creation of false gods</u> (especially when 'sworn by heaven and the <u>name</u> of God', breaking the 2nd Commandment), which future generations then blindly 'swear an oath to', thinking that they are 'swearing an oath to God' and 'swearing by the truth'... which ultimately leads to the blind hypocrisy of '<u>condemning others for following false gods</u>, while <u>it is you</u> who <u>also</u> is <u>following a false god</u>' (see James 5.12). Remember, when Satan deceives, people do not even know that they have been deceived, meaning that, by <u>swearing</u> 'oaths of allegiance', being <u>proudly</u> <u>rigid</u> and <u>absolute</u> in our thinking, Satan gets us to blindly and unknowingly follow him, while thinking that we are following God. Think here about 'a priest's oath of ordination', which is an oath sworn to the false god 'Catholicism' that they truly believe is sworn to the one true God. And so Jesus is telling us 'not to swear any oaths to God' (which is 'swearing by heaven', essentially breaking the 2nd Commandment) because He knows that it is 'the swearing by fallible, man-made knowledge' which will ultimately end in adultery (i.e., idolatry) by unknowingly swearing an oath to Satan. As Zephaniah 1.5 says about idolatrous priests, 'They worship and <u>swear oaths</u> by the Lord, but <u>also swear by Molech</u> (a false god)'. Note also that Jeremiah 5.2&7 says 'The unrighteous men of Jerusalem will say 'As the Lord lives', swearing things in

the <u>name of God</u>, <u>yet Surely they Swear falsely</u>, swearing by those that <u>are not gods</u>, thereby <u>committing adultery</u> against God'. To be clear, these quotes in <u>Jeremiah directly tie</u> 'swearing oaths to and by <u>God'</u> to 'swearing oaths to and by <u>false gods</u>', which is considered <u>adultery</u>, making it obvious that Jesus was <u>not</u> talking about '<u>individual</u> adultery between a man and woman' in Matthew 5.27-37. Thus, <u>Matthew 5.27-37</u> is speaking (in the <u>macro</u> or large sense) about <u>figurative marriages</u> <u>with Satan's figurative false husbands</u>, and also <u>figurative marriage oaths</u> that are blindly (due to <u>vanity</u>) sworn to Satan (or any false god), with these <u>figurative marriages</u> and <u>oaths</u> constituting <u>macro</u> <u>level adultery</u> against God. Note that this makes it obvious that '<u>Jesus was not at all concerned</u> <u>With monitoring the individual (i.e., micro level) marriage oaths or vows between a man and a</u> <u>woman</u>', and why <u>Jesus did not perform ONE marriage ceremony</u>; which is essentially 'the presiding over people swearing oaths'. Think about it. If Jesus did preside over a marriage ceremony, then He would be **contradicting** Himself, as He said 'Do not swear <u>any oaths</u> at all to God'.

In addition to all of these previous examples, it is worth listing out some other blatantly misinterpreted **sexual imagery** that has **already** been discussed in **Section 1**.

- A) <u>Adam and Eve's figurative nakedness</u> has been misinterpreted as <u>literal nakedness</u>, thereby leading us to believe that 'it was <u>sinful</u> for Adam and Eve to be <u>literally</u> naked, and for them to <u>literally eat fruit from God's favorite literal tree'</u>, when in actuality it was '<u>Satan's favorite</u> <u>figurative tree</u> of false knowledge' which he used to deceive people with. And by these misinterpretations, we have unrighteously demonized sexuality and nakedness, while <u>obscuring</u> the <u>real sin</u> (i.e., 'the fall of man', or 'the downfall of <u>any man in general'</u>), which was Adam and Eve's <u>blind ambition</u> to <u>rule over</u>, <u>oppress</u>, <u>enslave</u>, and be <u>supreme to others</u>, all while thinking that it was <u>God-like</u> to do so.
- B) <u>Noah's figurative nakedness</u> has been misinterpreted as <u>literal nakedness</u>, thereby leading us to believe that Ham was some sort of <u>sexual pervert</u>, when in <u>actuality</u> it was <u>Noah who had perverted justice</u>; again <u>oppressing</u> and <u>enslaving</u> the people that he ruled over. And so it was <u>Ham</u> who '<u>stood up for justice</u>' and was truly righteous; although Noah <u>cursed</u> Ham for essentially being 'the <u>whistleblower</u>' on <u>Noah's abuse of power</u>. It is also important to remember that, by these misinterpretations, we have consequently <u>redefined</u> the <u>personas</u> of <u>both Noah and Ham</u> essentially getting them totally <u>backwards</u> thereby creating a <u>false</u>, <u>fictitious Noah</u> and a <u>false</u>, <u>fictitious Ham</u> that <u>never even existed</u>; just like the <u>false</u>, <u>fictitious</u> <u>Jesus</u> that the Catholic Forefathers created based off of their blatant misinterpretations of the Gospels.
- C) The <u>prodigal son</u> and <u>his brother</u> have been misinterpreted as being <u>actual people</u>, when they are actually <u>symbolic figures</u> that represented the <u>Samaritans</u> of the Northern Kingdom of Israel (i.e., the prodigal son), and the <u>Jews</u> of the Southern Kingdom of Judah (i.e., the older brother). The prodigal son has always been portrayed as 'a man who goes off to a foreign country to <u>get drunk</u> and <u>have sex</u> with loose women'. But this parable once again has <u>nothing</u>

to do with sex or drinking, and the prodigal son actually represents 'the Samaritans who were acting as figurative harlots (i.e., Luke 15.30 says 'with harlots' as in 'being in the company of harlots') by worshiping false gods', while the older brother represents 'the Jews who thought that they had always followed God's Commandments (which they had not), and therefore wanted to exclude the Samaritans from salvation'.

It is interesting to note the irony that the Catholic hierarchy - in their blatant misinterpretation that 'they play the <u>role</u> of the <u>father</u>' - has used 'The Parable of the Prodigal Son' to <u>induce a</u> guilt complex on those who have left their evil institution (i.e., on those referred to as 'fallen away Catholics'), when in reality it is the Catholic Church itself that has 'fallen away from God' thereby unknowingly **becoming** 'the **prodigal** son'. That is, they have joined themselves to Satan by worshiping a false idol, 'the Eucharist', and a false god, 'Catholicism', just as the Samaritans worshiped 'a golden calf and Samaritanism', and eventually joined themselves to Baal ('a citizen of a foreign country'). And even more ironically, the Catholic Church (specifically the hierarchy) **also** plays the role of the older brother, wanting to exclude everyone from salvation who does not follow them in their 'prodigal living'. So to be clear, the Catholic hierarchy, and consequently many other religious hierarchies, blindly play the role of both prodigal son and older brother while pointing the finger at 'their own followers and followers of other religions' as being 'people who have fallen away from God'; with of course the blind religious leaders always thinking that 'they play the role of the father for God', and that they, in their supposedly merciful role as servant of God, will always accept us back. But we must realize that Satan's deceptions are boundless, and it is really Satan who the people are returning to. In all likelihood, most people at some time in their life have had a religious leader - Catholic or other - use 'the prodigal son' to make them feel guilty about 'not going to church' or 'not doing something that the religious leader deems as righteous', when the whole time 'The Parable of the Prodigal Son (and his brother)' was told to inform us about 'idolatrous people SUCh as that religious leader who themselves will be taken back by God if they come to their senses and return to the Father'. Thus, it is our religious leaders who have 'gone off to strange lands and played the harlot with false gods'. It is our religious leaders who blindly feed on Satan's swine food. And it is our religious leaders who try to exclude us from God's salvation if we don't worship their false gods. So it is our religious leaders who are actually 'unknowing prodigal sons and older brothers'.

Therefore, after examining all of these verses, it becomes obvious that, by <u>vainly speaking for God/Jesus</u> and thereby <u>misinterpreting</u> the <u>sexual imagery</u> in the Bible, our blind religious leaders have <u>projected unrighteous sexual guilt, shame</u>, and <u>judgment</u> on the multitudes, while <u>SimultaneOusly obscuring</u> their own idolatrous acts (i.e., <u>figurative adultery</u>) that have <u>caused</u> widespread 'division, war, and <u>hate'</u> - or violence and oppression - for thousands of years. And it is important to note once again that, because 'vainly speaking <u>for God'</u> (i.e., breaking the **2**nd Commandment) <u>causes</u>, and has caused for thousands of years, unfathomable desolation (i.e., 'division, war, and hate') with nearly <u>infinite negative consequences</u> for untold generations to come, it is this <u>figurative adultery</u> with Satan that is the <u>eternal</u> <u>sin</u> or 'the sin that will <u>not</u> be forgiven' (Luke 12.10); realizing of course that 'adultery between a man

and a woman' is rather <u>finite</u> (i.e., <u>not</u> affecting countless generations to come), and a sin that people <u>are forgiven</u> 'as they forgive others'. So we should ultimately understand that <u>God did not send His</u> <u>Son to earth to speak to people about their individual sexual habits</u> and <u>marital</u> <u>spats</u>, but rather to address the <u>macro issue</u> of <u>fornication with Satan</u>, and the <u>consequences</u> of 'nations committing <u>figurative</u> <u>adultery</u>'.

Jeremiah 3.8 says "Then I (God) saw that for all the causes for which backsliding Israel had committed <u>adultery</u> (and <u>played the **harlot**</u>, see verse 6), I had put her away and given her a <u>**certificate of**</u> **divorce**; yet her treacherous (i.e., violent and oppressive) sister Judah did not fear, but went and played the harlot also". Note that this divorce is reiterated in Isaiah 50.1. And Jesus says in Matthew 5.32 and 19.9 that 'fornication' with Satan or any of his false gods, false idols, false husbands, or false wives is <u>acceptable grounds for divorce</u>'. With the formation of the <u>false god</u> 'Catholicism' after Jesus' death, humanity (i.e., all those who follow organized religion) has subsequently been led astray into **unfathomable error**, and is thereby **guilty** of 'playing the harlot and **figuratively** fornicating with Satan'; which of course is figurative adultery against God. So we (i.e., humanity) must come to terms with the fact that, while we think that 'we are married to God', in actuality 'we are divorced from God'; remembering that 'the marriage of Jesus and His wife (i.e., humanity)' will not occur until His return (see Revelation 19.7). Think about it. If we are made in the image of God, and all of this sexual imagery has been used to describe God's relationship with His people - as if it can be paralleled to 'a relationship between a man and a woman' - then consider the way a man feels when he has been rejected over and over again by a woman. Obviously he will separate (or divorce) himself from that woman, avoiding having to see her, or even having to 'pass by her house'. God's feelings for His people are no different. Humanity has continually rejected Him. And then, when God sends His only Son to 'court us back', we do worse than we have ever done before, rejecting and killing Christ, thereby rejecting God's New Covenant, and subsequently shattering the hearts of God and Jesus into a million pieces. Thus **God**, not wanting to bear the fact that 'His bride did not want Him (or Jesus)', has divorced us; just as any man would do with a wife who continually rejects and ignores him, while 'playing the harlot' and 'fornicating with other men'. And so God will not 'pass by our house' until Jesus returns to reconcile us back to Him, when we will once again accept and want God, and reject all of Satan's false husbands, false wives, and false gods (i.e., our religious leaders and their religions). In other words, God will not 'pass by our house' until 'the **consummation** of Christ and humanity', which essentially involves the destruction of 'the house that humanity built', and the rebuilding of 'a new house based on God's original design: the New Covenant'.

18. Satan is Cast Out of Heaven, and Michael Slays the Beast

Consider a master architect/builder who draws a plan for some clients. The clients, proudly thinking that 'they know better', reject his plan, and hence tell him exactly 'what they want'. The master architect/builder reluctantly agrees to do what the clients want, and builds off of the client's plan. When all is complete, the clients are furious, and ultimately mad at the master architect/builder because the project is a disaster. That is, the clients <u>blame</u> the architect/builder for *allowing* them to <u>freely</u> (i.e., freewill) build what they wanted; remembering that, all he did was agree to their plan after they rejected his plan. Just like this example, God's plan for us is the New Covenant. And just like the clients, humanity, proudly thinking that 'they know better', has rejected His plan (i.e., the New Covenant) for 2000 years. God has reluctantly - as He has given humanity ultimate freewill allowed humanity's plan, under the direction of our 'blind bad eyes' (i.e., our religious leaders or false visionaries), to be instituted, resulting in 'furious clients' who are mad at God for allowing us to do what we want; as 'what humans want' has resulted in 'a house built on blind ambition to have power and wealth, which takes and takes, leaving the people and the land desolate'. So, as this 'house built on greed' cannot be sustained any longer, the time has come when God will send His Son, the Master Architect/Builder, a 'second time' (Isaiah 11.11) to tear down the house (i.e., temple) that humanity designed, and rebuild a new house based on God's Original design: the New Covenant. That new house or temple is 'Christ's body of believers': the living temple of the Living God and the Living Jesus (see section 15) made up of stones (i.e., people) that have been 'polished by the knowledge of Christ', and thus **repurposed**. Furthermore, just as 'we are made in the image and likeness of God', and can therefore conceive being patient for 6+ years while we wait for something to come to fruition, we must understand that God, being so much bigger than we can comprehend, has been patient with humanity and their 'flawed designs' for 6000+ years. As Nahum 1.3 and Jonah 4.2 says, 'God is slow to anger'. But God's patience have worn out, and 'the time of appeasement' is over, for God's day of wrath (i.e., 'the day of reckoning') is upon us, when He will throw Satan out of His house, essentially tearing down and destroying our old man-made house in order to rebuild (through Jesus Christ) a new house; that is, a new world or 'a new heaven and a new earth' (Revelation 21.1) built with people who are 'made new' by **belief** in the true words and true knowledge of Christ.

Most people think that 'Satan fell from heaven <u>a long time ago</u>'; this is <u>not true</u>. If 'God's house = <u>heaven and earth'</u>, then we can say for argument sake that heaven is the 'unseen, hidden spiritual realm', and earth is the 'seen, physical realm'; i.e., 'heaven = of the spirit' and 'earth = of the flesh'.

And, if we look at the <u>lack of peace</u> in our world today, our common sense tells us that 'there must be an <u>underlying unseen demonic force</u> that is <u>responsible</u> for all of the division, war, and hate'. So knowing that a demonic force <u>Still exists</u> in the unseen, hidden spiritual realm - recognizing of course that Satan has never been 'in the flesh' - and also knowing that the 'unseen, hidden spiritual realm' is heaven, we can <u>conclude</u> that 'Satan is Still in heaven'. Besides, if Satan was 'locked in hell', then we <u>surely</u> would have <u>already</u> attained world peace. As Revelation 20.1-3 says, 'The angel <u>cast Satan into the bottomless pit (i.e., hell)</u>, and set a seal on him so that <u>he could not deceive the nations for 1000 years'</u>.

Hence, if we can all agree that there has <u>never been 1000 years of peace</u> on earth, then we can also easily deduce that Satan still roams in the spiritual realm of **heaven**, 'deceiving the nations' until he is <u>cast out of heaven</u>, and is eventually <u>locked in hell</u>.

So we must understand that most people do not even realize that 'Satan still lives in God's figurative <u>house</u> as a <u>son</u> of God'; with of course the understanding that '<u>only</u> begotten Son' means '<u>chosen</u> Son', as Hebrews 11.17 uses the same exact term to describe Isaac, who was **not** Abraham's 'only begotten son', and realizing that 'Christ' itself means 'chosen One'. Revelation 12.7-9 speaks about 'Satan (i.e., the Dragon) warring with Michael (i.e., Jesus, which is discussed in this Section), with Satan being cast out of <u>heaven'</u>. And it is <u>confirmed</u> that this, 'Satan's fall from heaven', <u>will occur at 'the End of the Age' when</u> Christ returns (which is yet to occur) by examining Isaiah chapters 11-14. Isaiah 11.11 speaks of Christ's return (i.e., "The Lord shall set His hand again the second time"), and Isaiah 11.4 says 'Jesus will strike the earth with the <u>rod</u> of His mouth and <u>slay the wicked with the **breath** of **His lips**', which corresponds</u> to Revelation 19.15: 'Out of <u>Jesus' mouth</u> goes <u>a sharp two-edged sword</u>, that with it He should <u>strike</u> the nations, and rule them with a rod of iron'. Then Isaiah chapter 13, sounding much like the Book of Revelation, speaks of a Great Tribulation where 'Every man's heart will melt' (see Revelation 16.8-9). This is followed by 'the fall of Babylon' in chapter 14 (which corresponds to 'the fall of Babylon' (i.e., 'the hidden Roman Empire'), the Catholic Beast, and the Pope in Revelation chapters 18&19}, and ultimately 'the fall of Satan from heaven' in Isaiah 14.12. Therefore, contrary to us having been taught that 'Satan fell from heaven long ago', we can conclude that 'Satan still lives in God's house (in the unseen, spiritual realm) as a son of God, and is yet to be cast out (ultimately to hell)'. To clarify, since 'the Great Tribulation and the return of Christ' are **yet** to occur, then, according to the **order** of Isaiah chapters 11-14, 'Satan's fall from heaven' is also yet to occur; remembering that the entire world would already live in peace if Satan had already been 'cut down to the ground' (Isaiah 14.12) and 'cast out of heaven'.

Additionally, we must understand that, if Satan, an <u>angel</u>, is a <u>son</u> of God, then that consequently means that, since Jesus is 'the <u>Son</u> of God who is the <u>express image</u> of God', then <u>Satan</u> and <u>Jesus</u> are in fact <u>brothers</u>, and also <u>Jesus</u> is an <u>Angel</u> (i.e., <u>Michael</u>, the Archangel). <u>First</u> let's look at the evidence that confirms 'Jesus and Satan are brothers', then <u>second</u>, the evidence that confirms 'Jesus is an Angel, and of course the Chief Angel'.

In 'The Parable of the <u>Two Sons</u>' (Matthew 21.28-32), it is <u>Jesus Himself</u> - after being questioned by the Chief Priests and elders saying 'Who gave You Your authority' - who is the <u>first Son</u>. God sent Jesus (i.e., gave Him authority) to work in His vineyard, and knowing that this meant 'being cast out of the vineyard and <u>killed</u> by the evil tenants' (as in the following parable in Matthew), <u>Jesus obviously</u> did <u>not</u> want to go (see Matthew 26.39). But Jesus <u>did go</u> into the vineyard <u>anyway</u>, knowing that it was the will of His Father for the good of humanity. Thus, <u>Satan</u> is the <u>second</u> son who 'honored God with his words', saying that he would do the will of his Father, while actually <u>defying</u> his Father; noting that it is because Satan <u>defied</u> the Father, revolting against Him, that Jesus had to 'enter the vineyard' in the <u>flesh</u>. And if there is <u>any doubt</u> that you think this 'Parable of the Two Sons' is <u>not</u> about 'Jesus and Satan', then consider that, <u>immediately following</u> this parable in which 'a Son, knowing He will be <u>killed</u>, reluctantly

goes into the <u>vineyard</u> to work', Jesus tells 'The Parable of the Evil Tenants of God's Vineyard' in which it is <u>indisputable</u> that 'Jesus is the Son sent into the <u>vineyard</u> to be <u>killed</u>'. Additionally, it is quite coincidental that Jesus says in Matthew 18.21-22 that 'You should forgive your <u>brother</u> up to <u>70×7</u>', and Daniel 9.24-25 says 'After <u>seventy sevens</u> (i.e., <u>70×7</u>), there will be an <u>end</u> (or <u>remission</u>) of <u>sin</u>, a <u>rebuilding</u> of Jerusalem (i.e., God's house), and <u>Jesus will return</u> to bring everlasting righteousness'. So, while '70×7' is a number that only God can calculate, Jesus is directly saying in Matthew 18.21-22 that 'Satan (i.e., Jesus' brother) will be <u>forgiven</u> (or <u>allowed</u> by God to transgress God and Jesus) <u>70×7</u>, then the end will come'. Thus, after understanding these quotes, it becomes quite obvious that <u>Jesus Himself</u> (in parable form or **in code**) was stating that Satan is His brother.

As far as 'Jesus being an Angel', the first and most obvious piece of evidence is that Jesus Himself says that He's an Angel. In Revelation 22.16, Jesus says "I am the Bright and Morning Star", with Jesus defining in Revelation 1.20 that 'a star = an angel'; noting that 'the stars falling from heaven at the time of the end and Jesus' return' (see Matthew 24.29) are 'God's angels (both good and bad) coming out of the unseen, spiritual realm'. As a note, remember that Isaiah 14.12 also calls Satan the 'Morning Star', which actually makes sense, as 'Satan transforms himself into an angel of light' (2 Corinthians 11.14), thereby appearing to us as Michael (i.e., Jesus), 'the true Angel of light', and essentially acting as 'the ultimate evil twin brother', stealing Jesus' name and identity, and appearing to us as Jesus. And so if it is established that in fact 'Jesus is an Angel', would it not make sense that Jesus is 'the Leader of God's (good) angels'? I.e., would Jesus not be the Chief Angel? The term 'Archangel' means 'Chief Angel'. There can only be one Chief Angel, and coincidentally there is only one Archangel mentioned in the Bible: Michael. Thus it follows that Jesus is Michael the Archangel. The name 'Michael' means 'Who is like God?' Now some say that this means 'No one is like God'. But Genesis 1.26 says 'We are all made in the image and <u>likeness</u> of God', therefore we are all, to varying degrees, <u>like God</u>. So, the question should be 'Who is **most** like God or closest to the nature of God?' In all likelihood God's nature would be best personified in His Chief Angel, Michael. Think about it. Would God put someone in charge of 'His entire fleet and army of angels' if they did not think and feel the same way that God thinks and feels? Certainly not. So it is Michael, who commands 'God's legions of angels', that has a nature or persona most like the true nature or persona of God; remembering that Satan tempts people with 'being like God', but redefines the persona of God to be more like him (i.e., Satan) so that people blindly and unknowingly become 'more like the persona of Satan' while thinking that they are becoming 'more like the persona of God'. Coincidentally **Jesus** is also 'the One who is like God'. As Hebrews 1.3 says, 'Jesus is the express image of God'. Furthermore, Jude 1.9 says, "Yet Michael the Archangel, in contending with the devil (i.e., Satan), when He disputed about the body of Moses, dared not bring against him a reviling accusation, but said, 'The Lord rebuke you!'". Satan is 'Jesus' evil brother' who was <u>destined to betray</u> Jesus from 'the <u>beginning</u>'. **Contention** or **enmity** between Jesus and Satan is noted in Genesis 3.15, the <u>first</u> book of the Bible. God says to the serpent 'I will put <u>enmity</u> between your seed (i.e., Satan) and her Seed (i.e., Jesus)'. So, with contention and enmity between Jesus and Satan from 'the beginning', would it not be **Jesus** (as Michael) and **Satan** 'contending' or fighting in the spiritual realm about Moses? Note here that in Zechariah 3.1-2, Satan stands before the Angel of the Lord, in opposition to Him and Joshua, and the Angel of the Lord (presumed to be Jesus before the 1st

incarnation) says to Satan 'The Lord rebuke you!', which points to the fact that 'Jesus and Michael are the same Person', as it is Michael who said this very same line in Jude 1.9. Thus, noting the contention, enmity, and opposition between Jesus and Satan 'from the very beginning', it becomes obvious that Jesus (i.e., the Angel of the Lord) is the One who fights and makes war with Satan in the spiritual realm as Michael the Archangel. As Revelation 12.7-9 says about 'the End Time' and 'Satan being thrown out of heaven', "War broke out in heaven: Michael and his angels fought with the Dragon (i.e., Satan) and his angels, but they did not prevail, nor was a place found for them in heaven any longer. So the great Dragon and his angels were cast out (of heaven)."

To further establish that 'Jesus is Michael the Archangel', look at the following similarities between <u>1</u>, <u>2</u>, <u>and 3</u> in terms of 'the role that Michael plays' versus 'the role that Jesus plays' at the time of 'the End of the Age' and 'the 2nd coming of Jesus'. After comparing these, it becomes quite clear that Michael and Jesus indeed play the same role because They are indeed the same Person.

- **1.** Daniel 12.1&2 says "At that time (i.e., 'the End of the Age') Michael shall stand up (i.e., 'the 2^{nd} coming'), the great Prince (also referred to as Messiah the Prince in Daniel 9.25) who stands watch over the sons of your people; and there shall be a time of trouble (i.e., Great Tribulation), such as never was since there was a nation. And many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake. Some to everlasting life, some to shame and everlasting contempt."
- 2. Then, also pertaining to 'the End of the Age' and 'the 2nd coming', John 5.24-29 says "He who hears My (Jesus') word and believes in Him who sent Me has <u>everlasting life</u>, and shall not come into <u>judgment</u> (at 'the End of the Age'), but has <u>passed from death into life</u>. The hour is coming when the <u>dead</u> will hear <u>the voice</u> of the <u>Son of God</u>; and those who hear will live. For the hour (of Jesus' return) is coming in which <u>all who are in the graves will hear His (Jesus') voice</u> and <u>come forth</u> those who have done good, to the <u>resurrection of life</u> (i.e., everlasting life), and those who have done evil, to the <u>resurrection of condemnation</u> (i.e., everlasting contempt)."
- **3.** And finally, Paul also speaks about *'the End of the Age'* and *'the 2nd coming of Jesus'*, when those who have died will rise again. 1 Thessalonians 4.13-16 says "Concerning those who have **fallen asleep**, if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, God will bring with Him those who **sleep** in Jesus. We who are alive and remain **until the (2nd) coming of the Lord** will by no means precede those who are asleep. For the **Lord Himself** (i.e., Jesus) will descend <u>from heaven</u> with a **shout**, with the **voice of an Archangel**, and with the **trumpet** of God. And **the dead** in Christ **will rise first**."

And so we must recognize that the parallels between <u>Daniel 12.1&2</u> and <u>John 5.24-29</u> are remarkable, with almost <u>identical</u> language. Both quotes speak of **A)** 'the <u>End</u> of the Age', **B)** people who are dead rising to life to be <u>judged</u> (i.e., 'the judgment of nations' as in Matthew 25.32), and **C)** some receiving <u>eternal life</u>, while others receive <u>eternal damnation</u>. In Daniel 12.1&2, it is <u>Michael</u> who 'stands up' and initiates 'the judgment', but in John 5.24-29, it is <u>Jesus</u> who initiates 'the judgment'. Hence, this seems to make it <u>obvious</u> that Michael and Jesus are in fact 'the <u>same</u> Person' executing 'the <u>same</u> judgment of God at the End of the Age'. But to further tie these quotes together, Paul also says that '<u>Jesus</u> will return,

that 'the dead will rise when they hear the voice of an Archangel'. But Jesus already said in John 5.24-29 that 'the dead will rise when they hear His (i.e., Jesus') voice'. So, aside from Paul outwardly saying that 'Jesus' voice is the voice of an Archangel' in verse 16, by recognizing that 'the dead will rise when they hear Jesus' voice' and 'the dead will rise when they hear an Archangel's voice', it becomes apparent that 'the voice of an Archangel' = 'the voice of Jesus'. And, if Michael is the only Archangel, then 'the voice of Michael' = 'the voice of Jesus', thus proving that 'Michael the Archangel and Jesus are actually one in the same Person'. Besides, Jesus has countless names in the Bible such as Bright and Morning Star, Chief Cornerstone, Chief Shepherd, etc., therefore, is it so hard to believe that 'Michael, the Chief Angel, is just one more of the many names given to Jesus'?

Now that it is established that Jesus and Satan are **both** <u>Angels</u> and <u>Sons</u> of God (i.e., the <u>Father</u>) consequently making Jesus and Satan 'brothers' - and we can recognize that Satan still lives in God's house (which, by the way, is where we also live), then we can ultimately recognize that 'we are basically caught in the middle of the biggest family feud that ever was'. Knowing this, it helps answer, in simple terms, the difficult question, 'Why has Satan been allowed to deceive the nations for such a long period of time?' As esoteric as the religious leaders will try and make the nature of God, we must remember that 'we are made in the image and likeness of God'. And so our nature, in terms of family and personal relationships, is much like God's 'personal relationships' that He has with His immediate family. Recognizing this, it consequently makes the <u>answer</u> to this question quite simply that, 'God the Father has been reluctant (i.e., 'slow to anger') to throw his SON, Satan, out of His house', just as any **overly** patient, kind, merciful, and understanding **human** father would be with a problem son; realizing of course that 'God throwing Satan out of His house' = 'a sentence of eternal damnation'. If you think that this is hard to imagine, then again, remembering that 'we are made in God's image and likeness, with His emotions', consider how many human fathers have A) lied to the police to get their son out of jail, B) looked the other way when their son hurt or killed someone, or C) continued to give their son money or inheritance when they did nothing to deserve it. Furthermore, consider how many sons 'inherit a business from their father' and arrogantly act as though 'they built it from the ground up'; i.e., Satan acts as though he 'built', or is the Creator of this world, 'God's business'. Look at how many sons will 'put in place policies that their fathers would have never considered', running their father's business into the ground, just as Satan has run 'God's business' (i.e., this world) into the ground. Look at how many <u>arrogant</u> sons are 'born on third base and act as though they hit a triple'. Satan is **no** different, and he is truly 'the most arrogant of all sons', and is consequently 'least like the true nature of God'. Here we must try and understand and fathom that God's nature, which was revealed (and will be revealed again) in 'the humanity of Christ', is to avoid and look away from the proud and arrogant (i.e., the Arrogant One). That is, God, and consequently Christ, actively hides from the proud and arrogant (1 Peter 5.5). This non-confrontational nature of God/Christ that is 'slow to anger', coupled with God's love of freewill for all, essentially 'created the monster that we know as Satan'; a 'monster' that lusts after and spiritually fornicates uncontrollably with Jesus' bride. Thus, Satan has been allowed to deceive the nations for so long because of God's unfathomable love and mercy towards even Satan, His son, and because of the <u>freedom</u> that God intended for <u>all</u> creation... <u>even</u> Satan. But, because of Satan's

<u>sadistic, unforgivable lies</u> in the names of God and Jesus, and his acts of spiritual adultery, that '<u>freedom</u> intended for humanity' has become <u>enslavement</u>; and it is enslavement to a god (i.e., Satan) who is <u>not the true God</u>.

And so God's 'time of appeasement' is OVEr. God's time of allowing Satan to masquerade as Him and Jesus, thereby causing unfathomable 'division, war, and hate', is over. God, just like any kind and merciful human father, has been reluctant to pass 'the judgment of eternal damnation' on His own son, Satan. God has been reluctant, just like any human father, to punish His own son. But God can no longer look at what Satan has done to 'His business or vineyard'. He can no longer witness the squandering of His inheritance, and the darkness which Satan casts upon the whole world. And since Satan has committed 'the unforgivable sin of speaking lies in the name of God', his eternal sentence to hell has become <u>inevitable</u>. Jesus was sent to earth the <u>first time</u> to experience 'firsthand', and thus judge, the actions of His brother, Satan. Jesus will return a second time to execute that judgment by the power of God, in order that Satan's empire, under the disguise of 'God-made religion', is destroyed and cast into hell. From the start of the Bible, with <u>Cain killing Abel</u>, 'the evil, envious brother' has betrayed 'the good brother'. Joseph's brothers plotted against him, and sold him into slavery in Egypt. Jeremiah's brothers betrayed and 'dealt treacherously with him'. And it was Satan - envious of Jesus being 'the One who is like God' - who convinced Judas (under the direction of the blind religious leaders) to <u>betray</u> Jesus and have Him crucified. Yet when Jesus returns, 'the good Brother' will kill Satan, 'the evil, envious brother', for the attempted destruction of humanity. When Jesus (i.e., Michael) returns, <u>Satan's Beast</u> - which consists of '<u>all</u> of our religious leaders and <u>all</u> those of the **harlot** (i.e., our government leaders, corporate leaders, judges, etc.) who fornicated (or had spiritual intercourse) with our religious leaders' (see Revelation 17.1-2) - will be 'pulverized by the Stone, and His kingdom (or government, see Isaiah 9.7) shall stand forever, and never be destroyed' (Daniel 2.44-45).

When Jesus (i.e., 'the true Morning Star') returns, it will represent 'the Dawn', and we will move out of our <u>current</u> 'age of **darkness**' and into a <u>new</u> 'age of **light**', just as 'the sun rises, shutting out the <u>night</u> and bringing on the day'. Malachi 4.1-2 reiterates this by saying 'The day of the Lord is coming, when the <u>Sun of Righteousness</u> shall arise. It is burning like an <u>oven</u>, and will burn up all of the <u>proud</u> and the wicked.' So, remembering that **pride** is spiritually **blinding**, will we be able to <u>see</u> 'the Light of Dawn' when He rises? You will recall that, when Jesus walked the earth 2000 years ago, many could **not see** the Bright Light that stood right in front of them, even when conversing with Him face to face. Why? Satan, appearing as a 'false Bright and Morning Star' or 'false angel of light', had redefined light and darkness so that, due to pride in man-made tradition (i.e., ancestral sin), and subsequent blindness, people perceived 'Jesus' message of <u>light</u>' as being 'the <u>darkness</u> of Satan'; as Jesus **opposed** all of their supposedly holy traditions that were thought to have been instituted by God (who was really Satan in disguise). Therefore, we must recognize that, as Satan has 'redefined light and dark', we (just like our ancestors 2000 years ago) cannot fully identify true light and true dark, making us confuse the two, and ultimately making us confuse Jesus and Satan. And, if we can't lay our pride and egos aside, and admit that we cannot fully identify the real Satan and his darkness, we must come to face the reality that We will not be able to *identify* the **real Jesus** (i.e., the Light) when He arrives, just as our

ancestors 2000 years ago. Again, *humility* is the <u>only cure</u> for *spiritual blindness*, and the only way to '<u>see</u> the Light' when He returns. *Humility* is the only way to 'Again <u>discern</u> between the righteous (i.e., the <u>light</u>) and the wicked (i.e., the <u>dark</u>), between one who <u>truly</u> serves God (i.e., <u>Jesus</u>, the true and faithful Servant), and one who does <u>not</u> serve Him (i.e., <u>Satan</u>, the false servant)' (Malachi 3.18).

Hence, we must also face the reality that 'the Jesus that today's world knows' - which is a product of the Catholic Forefather's lies spoken from behind the **Eucharist** - is **not** 'the real Jesus'. Through centuries of 'changing the true intentions of Jesus' words', our religious leaders have systematically rewritten His identity. Our religious leaders have pieced together fragments of Jesus' life, and then think that they know Jesus' true identity and personality. That is, they have reconstructed an entire false personality, Jesus' supposed likes and dislikes, from a few Words that have been written down by 'people other than Jesus Himself'. Remember that even after the Holy Spirit was given to the Apostles, they still could **not** actually understand Jesus' true message that 'religion was man-made, not God-made' (Acts 11.18; and see also Mark 6.52 and 8.17 on 'the Apostles lack of understanding'). So, even the people <u>closest</u> to Him (i.e., the Apostles) could <u>not accurately convey</u> 'who Jesus really was'. Are we to believe then, that men (i.e., the Catholic Forefathers and all other subsequent Christian leaders) who never even met Jesus in the flesh, in fact 'know who Jesus really is'? Think about it. 1 John 2.4 says 'Those who say that they know Christ, yet do not keep His Commandments are liars'. If therefore our religious leaders (as this entire text has stated) are guilty of blatantly breaking the **Primary Commandment** and the **New Covenant** that Jesus died for, then they <u>prove</u> that 'they are <u>liars</u> who never knew Jesus'. Subsequently, 'the Jesus that our religious leaders have blindly taught us to know' is 'Satan's defiled version of the one true Jesus'. They have taught us to know 'the evil son of darkness' who poses as 'the good Son of light'; or 'the false Bright and Morning Star' who poses as 'the true Bright and Morning Star'. So after realizing that A) our blind religious leaders - by repeating their lies OVEr and OVEr again until they convince us that 'it is the truth' - have unknowingly taught us a 'false, fictitious Jesus that <u>never actually existed</u>', and recalling that **B)** people stood **face to face** with Jesus 2000 years ago and could not recognize Him, we must ask ourselves the all-important question: 'If Jesus showed up today in the flesh, do you think that you could recognize Him?' In other words, when history **repeats** itself in the near future, and Christ, a blue-collar Carpenter **not trained** in our theology schools and seminaries, opposes a worldwide religious institution, will we look at Him against the vast array of *supposedly* learned and prestigious religious leaders (all holding man-made PhD's) and <u>dismiss</u> Him as 'a crazy Man with a demon' (see John 8.48)? And will we be so proud, as they were 2000 years ago, of the false man-made knowledge that our religious leaders have taught us, that we will not listen to the Son of God when He returns? Unfortunately for some, the answer is 'Yes'. But unlike 'the first coming of Jesus' - when people who would not listen to Him, threw Jesus out of His own vineyard and killed Him - those who (because of pride) do not listen to Jesus' words when He returns, will be consumed by **fire** (as in 'burned in an oven' from Malachi 4.1), and 'Their flesh shall dissolve while they stand on their feet, with their (blasphemous) tongues dissolving in their mouths' (Zechariah 14.12). Remember, A) 'Jesus is the One who baptizes with fire' (Luke 3.16), B) Revelation 16.8-9 says that 'The men who blaspheme the names of God and Jesus will be scorched with fire and great heat', C) Isaiah 66.16 says 'For by fire and by His sword (i.e., words) Jesus will judge all flesh, and the slain shall be many', and D) Acts 3.21-23 says - about 'Jesus' return' and 'the time of restoration of all things' - 'Every soul who will not listen to Christ will be utterly destroyed'. Thus, if we are not aware that our blasphemous blind religious leaders have taught us to 'know a false christ' (i.e., a false persona of Christ, and consequently a false god), then we are at risk of proudly not listening to the true Christ, thereby being 'consumed by the fire of Christ' and being 'utterly destroyed by the Living God and His angels'. As Proverbs 16.18 says, "Pride goes before destruction, and an arrogant spirit before a fall".

When the **real** Christ is **revealed** - remembering that 'No one knew the name of the Christ, except Christ Himself' (Revelation 19.12), implying that **He is already here**, 'walking among us' and we don't even know it - again, history will repeat itself, and our proud religious leaders, just like the Pharisees, Scribes, and elders of 2000 years ago, will come face to face with 'Why it was so difficult to believe the words of Jesus'. Our proud religious leaders, along with many brainwashed followers, will finally get the chance to find out for themselves if they would have 'accepted the truth of Christ', regardless if it conflicted with everything that they had ever been taught from the time of their childhood. And we will find out if their humility is true or false when they realize that they have used the name of Jesus 'day in and day out', yet unknowingly and blindly used His name to incite 'division, war, and hate'. Unfortunately, for many religious leaders who pride themselves on being wise and learned in spiritual matters, to find out that Satan has *outsmarted* and *deceived* them to the magnitude that he has, is something their egos cannot handle; noting that, double mindedly they will say 'Yes, Satan is the most deceptive being EVET, but No, Satan can't deceive me into unknowingly doing his will'. So as much as our religious leaders say 'I believe in Jesus', they have no idea what it means to 'truly believe in Jesus', and their deadly pride will not allow them to even fathom that they have never actually believed in Jesus, but rather in a 'defiled imposter Jesus'; that is, Satan, Jesus' evil brother who appears as Jesus and uses all of Jesus' same words, yet gives them defiled meaning. Hence, to 'truly believe in Jesus' we must believe in 'the destruction of religion', as they are all Satan's false gods that promote supremacy and exclusion: the breeding ground for 'division, war, and hate'. We must believe that 'there is no such thing as religion', as religion is a man-made device for **oppression** and **enslavement** using the name of God. We must **believe** in 'the destruction of all temples', as they are merely false idols from behind which Satan's false prophets put words in the mouth of God, thereby breaking His Primary Commandment and New Covenant. We must believe in 'the destruction of all false idols', in particular the Eucharist (i.e., the Abomination of Desolation, and the Image of the Beast), which is a false image of Christ that has been used by Catholicism to cause unfathomable desolation, and a false idol from behind which the Catholic hierarchy speaks lies that are the total antithesis of the truth of Christ. In other words, we must believe in 'the destruction of the Eucharist', as it is 'the cornerstone of the Catholic Church's wall of lies', and truly 'the source of division, war, and hate'. Thus, for most religious leaders, particularly Catholic, 'to believe in Jesus' means 'to leave everything that they have ever known' (Luke 5.11)... including their pride and their egos. And so, whether they know it or not, this is the Catholic hierarchy's chance to see if they would have truly been 'an Apostle of Christ', leaving everything behind to follow the Light.

"The kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matthew 10.7), and consequently the time has come for all to leave everything they have ever been taught about God and Jesus by the false prophets and false teachers of our religions (i.e., false gods). That is, the time has come for 'the Exodus of all mankind' from the darkness and enslavement perpetuated by Satan's false gods, and spiritually move to a new place of *light* and *freedom*, following the Light out of **bondage** when He returns to set us free (Luke 4.18). The time has come for us to 'spiritually divorce' all of our false husbands and false wives who have figuratively married themselves to us, thereby keeping us blindly joined to Satan, while thinking that we are **joined** and **married** to God; noting that, if we do **not** divorce our false husbands, then it will be impossible to 'figuratively marry our true Husband (i.e., Jesus)' when He comes. And so when our false husbands and wives realize that they have, acting as Satan stand-ins, actually committed fornication (i.e., spiritual intercourse) with Jesus' bride, they will look down in shame, seeing for the first time their nakedness (i.e., 'lack of knowledge'). As Zechariah 13.2-5 says 'In that day (i.e., the day of Christ's return), the false prophets and unclean spirit will depart from the land, the false idols will be cut off, and every false prophet, ashamed of his teachings, will remove the vestments and robes which he wore to deceive others with, saying 'I am no prophet'. But we must ask ourselves, knowing the pride with which our false prophets (i.e., our religious leaders) blindly teach Satan's false knowledge, thinking that it is true knowledge, 'What could possibly make our false prophets remove their vestments and robes, and <u>admit</u> that <u>they are **not** true prophets or <u>teachers</u> of God at all?' Remember, the 3 major</u> prophecies concerning 'the return of Christ and the End Time' (see Section 5) speak of a Great <u>Tribulation</u> or worldwide correction in order to 'cast out (or make depart) all the false prophets who <u>deceive</u> the multitudes, and blindly scatter the nations for Satan'; also remembering that all 3 prophecies speak of worldwide deception. Thus, it is this Great Tribulation - i.e., God's time of reckoning, or a time when our false prophets who speak blasphemy against God and Jesus develop 'foul and loathsome sores', 'qnaw their tongues', and are 'scorched with fire' (Revelation 16.2, 8-10) - that will make some of them (as Revelation 16.11 says that 'many will not repent') come to their senses, shaking them out of their hypnotized state of blindly responding to the will of Satan. And it is this Great Tribulation or worldwide correction that will bring mankind, in a mass Exodus, out of darkness and into the light that is 'the kingdom of God'.

Hence we must come to understand that we will never have true world peace Without this worldwide correction. That is, if we are not corrected by God, then we will never know peace, and we will stay blind to the *lies* that every religion has inherited, thinking they are the truth. So if we truly want peace, then we will open our minds and humble ourselves to the possibility that 'The truth, as we have received from our religious forefathers, is not the truth'. But the truth is not as hard as you think to accept. Imagine no more labels of Jew, Catholic, Protestant, Christian, Muslim, Buddhist, Or Hindu. No more 'we are chosen people' or 'they are chosen people', as anyone who truly 'loves and judges others as themselves' (John 13.34) is chosen. That is, imagine that salvation has nothing to do with belonging to a specific group of people, as everyone already belongs to the group called 'humanity'. Imagine simply being 'people' without all of our silly religious names, titles, labels, and affiliations that cause division and inequality, which of course leads to war, hate, oppression, and

enslavement. Remember, 'we are all born <u>equal</u> of water', and 'every nation of men is from <u>one</u> blood' (Acts 17.26). If we truly <u>believe</u> this <u>simple concept</u>, understanding that our religious <u>labels</u> (i.e., Satan's 'seeds of division') do nothing but obscure this basic <u>equality</u> and <u>unity</u> of humanity, then we can <u>eliminate</u> forever these senseless religious names, titles, labels, and affiliations, so that we no longer <u>kill</u> each other over <u>absolutely nothing at all</u>. Thus, we must realize that religion (i.e., Satan's beautifully disguised false gods) is the <u>last great hidden prejudice</u> that causes division and inequality (through the <u>supremacy</u> of believing 'salvation is <u>exclusive</u> to only certain groups'), and it is religion that ultimately keeps us from being 'unified as one in <u>peace</u>'. And so once we are corrected by God (i.e. the Great Tribulation), the eradication of our prejudices which are based on Satan's false gods (i.e., religions), and our <u>subsequent realization of equality</u>, will <u>unify</u> us, and there will only be 'one God' (Zechariah 14.9), with humanity having 'one heart and one way' (Jeremiah 32.39); which essentially equates to <u>true</u> world peace.

Additionally, it is important that we not be fooled by our religious leaders, especially the Catholic hierarchy, who 'call for world peace'. They are just like the religious leaders thousands of years ago who 'called for peace and harmony', just as long as the multitudes stayed in blind harmony as slaves to them (think of the 'forced harmony' of everyone 'marching in unison' under the brutal regime of Hitler). In other words, they say that they want peace and harmony, but once their authority and supremacy as leaders is threatened, they will justify war and discontent in order to keep their hidden positions as master, with us as slave; noting that Jesus threatened the religious leaders' authority and supremacy 2000 years ago, and so they justified the murder of an innocent Man in order to keep their positions as master. So, just as his ancestors who killed Christ, the Pope and all his ministers (which will include leaders from other religions at the time of Armageddon) will justify murder 'in the name of **God'**, all to hold on to the **authority** that Satan has granted them (of course, 'in the name of God'). Thus, the Catholic hierarchy's message of peace, once tested, will show itself to be 'a message of false peace'. Once tested, it will show itself as 'peace, only under the direct rule of the false god, Catholicism'. Peace, as long as they <u>retain control and power</u>. <u>Peace</u>, as long as they stay '<u>master disquised as servant</u>'. **Peace**, as long as they can disguise 'slavery as freedom'. And ultimately, once tested, Catholicism's message of peace will show itself to be 'peace, only under a hidden dictatorship'. But all these are simply forms of 'false peace and false harmony', just as many other dictators (i.e., Hitler) throughout history have promised. That is, they promise peace as long as 'they are master and you are their slave'. They promise peace as long as 'you stay subservient to them'. Therefore, we must know that Catholicism's words of peace are a **lie**, and their message is one of **false peace** and **false harmony**.

In the story of 'David and Goliath', David cut off the head of Goliath with 'Goliath's own sword' (1 Samuel 17.50-51). Similarly, the Catholic hierarchy parades around 'the sword of Christ' - i.e., 'Jesus' words', see Ephesians 6.17 where 'sword = the word of the God' - making it known that they are the ones responsible for preserving, so meticulously, the words of Christ for 2000 years, therefore acting as though they own His words (or they own 'the sword of Christ'). And so it is ironic that this entire text, which contains the true meanings and interpretations of Christ's words, will be used to ultimately destroy the Catholic Church. In other words, Catholicism's own sword - i.e., the words of Christ that they

have *preserved* and *carefully handed down* through the centuries - is the very sword that will be used by one Man (i.e., Michael/Jesus) to cut off the head of the Catholic Beast; just as Goliath's own sword was used by David (a mere 'youth') to cut off the head of a giant. To reiterate, Michael will slay the

Beast with the very sword possessed by the Beast. As Revelation 13.10 says "He who kills with the sword must be killed with the sword" (see also Matthew 26.52). And as Jesus said 2000 years ago, "The word (i.e. 'sword') that I have spoken will judge (i.e., slay) them in the last day" (John 12.48).

And so as mentioned in Section 3, this entire text - which is 'the word' and 'the sharp two-edged sword of Christ/Michael' - is evidence brought against Catholicism, and serves as both an indictment and **guilty verdict** for the **Catholic hierarchy** (which includes 'all other subsequent religious hierarchies' and 'leaders of the harlot with whom they have spiritually fornicated'), who has blatantly broken God's <u>Primary Commandment</u> and <u>New Covenant</u>, thereby resulting in <u>countless generations</u> and <u>multitudes</u> of people living in desolation, violence, oppression, and enslavement. I.e., this serves as both an indictment and guilty verdict for 'all our religious leaders both past and present, and those governmental leaders with whom they are spiritually joined', for having committed crimes against humanity. And, in particular, this serves as both an indictment and guilty verdict for the Catholic Forefathers and their present day descendents who are responsible for creating and propagating a false image of Christ, the Eucharist; which of course has been our hidden 'source of **division, war, and hate'** for almost 2 millennia. The <u>lies</u> and misinterpretations that have been spoken about Jesus and God from behind the Eucharist are immeasurable, and are piled so high that they have reached heaven, and God can no longer tolerate them. Therefore, 'the time of appearement' is over, and Satan, the 'father of lies' who is the one responsible for Catholicism's lies, will be thrown out of God's house and into hell, accompanied by the Catholic Beast (which includes all of our religions). The time has come when <u>Catholicism's 'wall of lies'</u>, with the <u>Eucharist as its cornerstone</u>, will come crashing down to reveal the true light of God to all those held captive beneath its looming darkness.

The Israelites *surrounded* the City of Jericho *with* the ark of the **Covenant** of God, and the <u>Walls of Jericho</u> fell when a trumpet was sounded and they all 'shouted at once'. Joshua 6.20 says, "And it happened when the people heard the sound of the trumpet, and the people shouted with a great shout, that the wall fell down flat". Jesus will soon be revealed, and He will 'sound the trumpet of God' and 'shout the truth with the voice of Michael the Archangel' (1 Thessalonians 4.16). When He does, we must surround 'the Catholic Church's wall of lies' with the truth of Christ; i.e., God's New Covenant. If, when Jesus sounds the trumpet, we all 'shout' the truth at once, their 'wall of lies' will come crashing down, just like the Walls of Jericho. If, when Jesus sounds the trumpet, we all 'shout' the truth at once, we will surely see the light of God and world peace in our lifetime. So if you think world peace is impossible, remember that 'Nothing is impossible with God'. And if you think world peace 'can't be done', remember that people have always said 'It can't be done'... UNTIL IT'S DONE (John 19.30, Revelation 16.17, and Revelation 21.6).

Sections

1. A False Persona of God is a false god	P. 1
2. The True New Covenant: Hidden in Plain Sight by the Darkness	P. 82
3. The Eucharist: Source of Division, War, and Hate	P. 112
4. The Catholic Church's Message of False Peace	P. 166
5. Three Major Prophecies of 'The End Time' with Three Major Common Threads	P. 185
5.1 Prophecy of the Abomination of Desolation	P. 186
5.2 Prophecy of the Image of the Beast	P. 192
5.3 Prophecy of 'The End of the Age'	P. 201
6. Prophecies from 'The Revelation of Peter'	P. 209
7. Flesh is the Word of Jesus, Blood is the Holy Spirit	P. 216
8. The Eucharist: Cornerstone of the Catholic Church's Wall of Lies	P. 240
9. Blind Hypocrisy caused by the Sacrament of Confession	P. 265
10. Catholicism's False Authority to Forgive Sins	P. 287
11. False Prejudgments based on the Concept of Mortal Sins	P. 308
12. The Anti-Good News: False Justification by Deeds of the Catholic Law	P. 313
13. Equality: the True Meaning of Water Baptism	P. 323
14. Man-made Obligations on the Sabbath	P. 346
15. We are the Temple of the Living God	P. 352
16. The Catholic Church's Prison of Sexual Guilt and Judgment	P. 358
17. Sexual Imagery used in the Bible to Describe Idolatry	P. 373
18. Satan is Cast Out of Heaven, and Michael Slays the Beast	P. 387