

town." When God comes to establish His kingdom on earth, it will be a quick and efficient apocalypse that will cause people's hearts to fail and many others begging to be buried alive to hide them from "the Lamb's wrath." When Christ reins in our kingdom from David's throne in Jerusalem, the Bible states that He will rule the world with a "rod of iron." That probably refers to a shepherd's staff that was normally made of wood. Justice and fairness will rule, and political correctness will find no refuge anywhere.

If the eschatology of God's kingdom is studied, we find a progression of God's restoral; Christ came first to conquer sin, sickness will be conquered in the Millennial Kingdom, and death will be conquered in the *new heavens and new earth*. In the Bible, death is referred to as God's "last enemy." And, the dominant theme of God's restoral is unity and oneness. This is the contrast between the two kingdoms: one is predicated on unity and oneness while the other is predicated on division. One is bent on controlling others through authority condoned by condemnation and low self-esteem while the other is bent on mutual submission through love and persuasion.

The church, as just another competing kingdom in the world morass of kingdoms, and just another divider accordingly, distinguishes itself as the only worldly kingdom that actually wages war against the Holy Spirit that it claims to love. One of the most dominant themes of the Bible is the following centerpiece: making the Jews and Gentiles one body in Christ through the baptism of the Spirit. Therefore, our kingdom, that is, God's kingdom, is future, and Jewish. Herein is the crux of election: it involves things predetermined by God that are unchangeable as opposed to the traditions of men. The church makes that fact a matter of individual pre-selection for salvation or damnation and then goes about voiding the word of God with its traditions.

Israel was elected as God's future kingdom. As the world's resident kingdom divider specializing in obstructing the work of the Spirit, the founding fathers of the church set out to do just the opposite; to divide Jew and Gentile and join in with the world for

purposes of wiping Israel off the face of the earth. The church can run from this documented history, but it cannot hide from it. And as a consummate divider using “disagreement among good men” as an excuse for its rotten fruit, this wasn’t just a Catholic thing, it was every bit Protestant as well. A tree is known by its fruit, and no fruit is indicative of an evil tree more than anti-Semitism. The church should be summarily rejected on this fact alone.

Two primary theologians of the Roman church, that is, the selected epicenter for authority over the ekklisia shortly after the departing of Paul and Peter, emerge and seek to demonize the people of God making a strong distinction between the Jews and Christianity. Remember, one of the primary objectives of the Holy Spirit was to make Jew and Gentile ONE body in Jesus Christ (Eph 2:11-22). This is/was one of the primary objectives of the Holy Spirit. The church’s two foundational theologians in its 4th century infancy were St. Augustine of Hippo, and St. Jerome. Both are Saints and Doctors of the Roman Catholic Church. However, Protestant scholars lay claim to these same men as their foundational Doctors of Grace as well.

“Church Fathers like St John Chrysostom, St Ambrose, St Jerome and St Augustine (second only to St Paul as a Christian authority for the Western world) had by the end of the fourth century AD crysallised a demonic image of the Jew who combined superhuman malevolence with total spiritual blindness... The monkish, ascetic St Jerome, embittered by the spectacle of successful missionizing in Antioch by the large Jewish population, denounced the synagogue in these terms: ‘If you call it a brothel, a den of vice, the Devil’s refuge, Satan’s fortress, a place to deprave the soul...you are still saying less than it deserves.’”

“This theology is for the first time institutionalized in the fourth century AD, when Christianity becomes the official religion of the Roman Empire.”<sup>6</sup>

Author John Immel, in his conference presentation<sup>7</sup> regarding the use of Martin Luther's theology by the Nazis, cites quotations from Luther's publication, *The Jews and Their Lies*:

Shame on you, you damned Jews, that you dare to apply this earnest, glorious, comforting word of God so despicably on your mortal greedy belly and that you are not ashamed to display your greed so openly. You are not worthy of looking at the outside of the Bible, much less of reading it. You should read only the Bible that is found under the sow's tail, and eat and drink the letters that drop from there.

They curse us goyim (literally means ‘nations’ but is used as a pejorative for all non-Jews). In their synagogues and in their prayers, they wish us every misfortune. They rob us of our money and goods through their usury, and they play on us every wicked trick they can. And the worst of it is that they still claim to have done right and well, that is, to have done God a service. And they teach the doing of such things. No pagan ever acted thus. In fact, no one acts thus except the devil himself, or whomever he possesses, as he has possessed the Jews.

To divide Jews from the body of Christ is an audacious throwing down of the gauntlet against the Holy Spirit. But Jerome and company were far from going to war with the Holy Spirit on that front alone.

Though an aside from the kingdom subject, and a risk of suggesting that the church only wages war against the Spirit on a handful of fronts, Jerome set out to translate the Bible in the bureaucratic language of the empire and make it inaccessible to the

laity and common people via the Latin Vulgate. Eventually, Rome made it against the law to translate the Bible or even teach from it unless accredited by the church upon pain of death. This was Rome's mandate for about 1000 years:

Decree of the Council of Toulouse (1229 C.E.): "We prohibit also that the laity should be permitted to have the books of the Old or New Testament; but we most strictly forbid their having any translation of these books."

Ruling of the Council of Tarragona of 1234 C.E.: "No one may possess the books of the Old and New Testaments in the Romance language, and if anyone possesses them he must turn them over to the local bishop within eight days after promulgation of this decree, so that they may be burned..."

Proclamations at the Ecumenical Council of Constance in 1415 C.E.: Oxford professor, and theologian John Wycliffe, was the first (1380 C.E.) to translate the New Testament into English to "...helpeth Christian men to study the Gospel in that tongue in which they know best Christ's sentence." For this "heresy" Wycliffe was posthumously condemned by Arundel, the archbishop of Canterbury. By the Council's decree "Wycliffe's bones were exhumed and publicly burned and the ashes were thrown into the Swift River."

Fate of William Tyndale in 1536 C.E.: William Tyndale was burned at the stake for translating the Bible into English. According to Tyndale, the Church forbid owning or reading the Bible to control and restrict the teachings and to enhance their own power and importance.<sup>8</sup>

The church also took it upon itself to establish the formal canon of the New Testament which was only in the form of letters written

by the apostles and others. There were many copies of these letters circulated among the laity and commonly accepted as Scripture:

2 Peter 3:15 – And count the patience of our Lord as salvation, just as our beloved brother Paul also wrote to you according to the wisdom given him, 16 as he does in all his letters when he speaks in them of these matters. There are some things in them that are hard to understand, which the ignorant and unstable twist to their own destruction, as they do the other Scriptures.

Colossians 4:15 – Give my greetings to the brothers at Laodicea, and to Nympha and the church in her house. 16 And when this letter has been read among you, have it also read in the church of the Laodiceans; and see that you also read the letter from Laodicea. 17 And say to Archippus, “See that you fulfill the ministry that you have received in the Lord.”

1 Corinthians 14:37 – If anyone thinks that he is a prophet, or spiritual, he should acknowledge that the things I am writing to you are a command of the Lord. 38 If anyone does not recognize this, he is not recognized.

Therefore, the idea that there was no agreed upon collective Scripture for New Testament era believers is unfounded, and the body of Christ hardly needed Gnostic academics to tell them what was inspired and not inspired. Nevertheless...

The Council of Nicaea called by the Emperor Constantine met in 325 C.E. to establish a unified Catholic Church. At that point no universally sanctioned Scriptures or Christian Bible existed. Various churches and officials adopted different texts and gospels. That's why the Council of Hippo sanctioned 27 books for the New Testament in 393 C.E. Four years later the Council of Cartage

confirmed the same 27 books as the authoritative Scriptures of the Church.<sup>9</sup>

And...

In 382, Pope Damascus therefore commissioned Jerome (c. 347-420) to translate the Bible into Latin, a task which took him twenty years to complete. This Bible came to be known as the *versio vulgata* (common translation) and became standard for the Western Church.<sup>10</sup>

Attempting to obstruct the Spirit's work in baptizing the Jews and Gentiles into one body and confiscating the sword of the Spirit from the laity (remember, the word is the "sword of the Spirit" [Eph 6:17] and what the Spirit uses to sanctify [John 17:17]) are two examples among many, but we will conclude this line of thought with the church's foundational attempt to divide genders. It is to be expected that gender equality is a huge issue in the church today, giving rise to so-called Christian Feminism because like all worldly kingdoms, it's all about the divisiveness. There is only one group of people that the church fathers hated more than the Jews: women. In the same way hatred for the Jews began with the church fathers and manifested in the Protestant Reformation 1100 years later, the same can be said for the church's hatred for women.

Many avenues regarding church hatred towards women could be explored, but we will begin with what is sometimes referred to as the "witch wars." The war declared on witches by the Catholic Church and the Reformers resulted in casualties that surpass many, many, wars waged throughout history. And, to say the least, the due process of law that determined who was a witch was, well, shall we say, a little lean. Since it was thought that 90% of all witches were women, if you were a woman, and dragged into court, actually, the "Kirk" from which we get the word "church," your gender was a bad start to the process.

The climate of fear created by churchmen of the Reformation led to countless deaths of accused witches quite independently of inquisitional courts or procedure. For example, in England where there were no inquisitional courts and where witch-hunting offered little or no financial reward, many women were killed for witchcraft by mobs. Instead of following any judicial procedure, these mobs used methods to ascertain guilt of witchcraft such as “swimming a witch,” where a woman would be bound and thrown into water to see if she floated. The water, as the medium of baptism, would either reject her and prove her guilty of witchcraft, or the woman would sink and be proven innocent, albeit also dead from drowning.<sup>11</sup>

It all started with the Catholics, and the Reformers later joined the campaign that supplemented the inquisition:

Pope John XXII formalized the persecution of witchcraft in 1320 when he authorized the Inquisition to prosecute sorcery...” Thereafter papal bulls and declarations grew increasingly vehement in their condemnation of witchcraft and of all those who “made a pact with hell.” In 1484 Pope Innocent VIII issued the bull Summis desiderantes authorizing two inquisitors, Kramer and Sprenger, to systematize the persecution of witches. Two years later their manual, *Malleus Maleficarum*, was published with 14 editions following between 1487-1520 and at least 16 editions between 1574-1669. A papal bull in 1488 called upon the nations of Europe to rescue the Church of Christ which was “imperiled by the arts of Satan.” The papacy and the Inquisition had successfully transformed the witch from a phenomenon whose existence the Church had previously rigorously denied into a phenomenon that

was deemed very real, very frightening, the antithesis of Christianity, and absolutely deserving of persecution.

It was now heresy not to believe in the existence of witches. As the authors of the *Malleus Maleficarum* noted, “A belief that there are such things as witches is so essential a part of Catholic faith that obstinately to maintain the opposite opinion savors of heresy.” Passages in the Bible such as “Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live” were cited to justify the persecution of witches (*Ibid.*).

The following gives us an idea as to the extent that this was going on:

Contemporary accounts hint at the extent of the holocaust. Barbara Walker writes that “the chronicler of Treves reported that in the year 1586, the entire female population of two villages was wiped out by the inquisitors, except for only two women left alive.” Around 1600 a man wrote:

Germany is almost entirely occupied with building fires for the witches... Switzerland has been compelled to wipe out many of her villages on their account. Travelers in Lorraine may see thousands and thousands of the stakes to which witches are bound (*Ibid.*).

The general mentality of the Eve motif was part and parcel with the war on witches:

The witch hunts were an eruption of orthodox Christianity’s vilification of women, “the weaker vessel,” in St. Peter’s words. The second century St. Clement of Alexandria wrote: “Every woman should be filled with shame by the thought that she is a woman.” The Church father Tertullian explained why

women deserve their status as despised and inferior human beings:

“And do you not know that you are an Eve? The sentence of God on this sex of yours lives in this age: the guilt must of necessity live too. You are the devil’s gateway: you are the unsealer of that tree: you are the first deserter of the divine law: you are she who persuaded him whom the devil was not valiant enough to attack. You destroyed so easily God’s image, man. On account of your desert that is, death even the Son of God had to die.”

Others expressed the view more bluntly. The sixth century Christian philosopher, Boethius, wrote in *The Consolation of Philosophy*, “Woman is a temple built upon a sewer.” Bishops at the sixth century Council of Macon voted as to whether or not women had souls. In the tenth century Odo of Cluny declared, “To embrace a woman is to embrace a sack of manure...” The thirteenth century St. Thomas Aquinas suggested that God had made a mistake in creating woman: “nothing [deficient] or defective should have been produced in the first establishment of things; so woman ought not to have been produced then.” And Lutherans at Wittenberg debated whether women were really human beings at all. Orthodox Christians held women responsible for all sin. As the Bible’s Apocrypha states, “Of woman came the beginning of sin/ And thanks to her, we all must die” (*Ibid.*).

And the Reformers were completely onboard with the Eve rage of the Day:

St. Augustine of Hippo (354 to 430 CE). He wrote to a friend:

“What is the difference whether it is in a wife or a mother, it is still Eve the temptress that we must beware of in any woman.....I fail to see what use woman can be to man, if one excludes the function of bearing children.”

Martin Luther (1483 to 1546):

“If they [women] become tired or even die, that does not matter. Let them die in childbirth, that’s why they are there.”

St. Thomas Aquinas (1225 to 1274 CE):

“As regards the individual nature, woman is defective and misbegotten, for the active force in the male seed tends to the production of a perfect likeness in the masculine sex; while the production of woman comes from a defect in the active force or from some material indisposition, or even from some external influence.”

But the Reformers did more than stand on the sidelines and cheer. While doing a pdf document search on *Witch-Hunts In Europe And America, An Encyclopedia* by William Burns, “Calvin” got 32 hits including the following:

There are about five hundred recorded witch trials in the 150 years after Calvin’s arrival in Geneva. Given the high rate of survival of Genevan records, this probably represents the majority of cases that occurred. The witch-hunt in Geneva peaked relatively early, in the 1560s and early 1570s. The records show that, outside the witch-hunt of 1571, Geneva had one of the lowest rates of execution in Europe, about 20%. Geneva magistrates seem to have used banishment as an alternative to execution in cases where the guilt or innocence of the subject was in doubt, rather than following the practice of

other areas which simply tortured until a confession was obtained. The relatively mild torture practiced by the Genevans kept individual witch cases from developing into large hunts, and in some cases the magistrates were uninterested in following up accusations even when an accused witch named others...

The comparatively small kingdom of Scotland, whose legal system blended English and Continental elements, had from the mid-sixteenth century on a zealous Calvinist clergy intent on creating a godly society. It executed the most witches of any British region. The other British area of high witch-hunting activity was the legally anomalous Channel islands....

William Perkins was Elizabethan England's leading Calvinist theologian, and his posthumously published *A Discourse on the Damned Art of Witchcraft* (1608) had an unrivalled influence on subsequent Puritan demonologists in old and New England. Perkins's approach was intellectually austere. He shunned reference to previous demonologists or actual cases of witchcraft, and based his argument almost entirely on the Bible, particularly Exodus 22.18, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live." Perkins saw the essential nature of witchcraft as the making of the satanic pact, or "covenant," which inverted the covenant relation between God and his elect that was basic to Puritan Calvinist theology. So closely does Perkins relate the witch's contact with the Devil to the good Christian's contact with God that he claims that to deny the possibility of physical contact with devils would be to deny the possibility of covenant with God. Perkins describes the making of the covenant as a simple

agreement, without the necessity for the witch to sign in blood or kiss or have sex with the Devil. Other central aspects to the witch stereotype as the sabbat or the Devil's mark he also ignored. Even maleficia played a minor role. Perkins's principal target was not the maleficent witch, but the "good witch," whom he described over and over as even more worthy of death than the evil witch. Perkins believed that all power to perform "magic" could only come from Satan.

William Perkins was the elder statesman of the very same Calvinist Puritans that boarded the Mayflower and landed on Plymouth Rock. John Robinson, their pastor and follower of Perkins, gave an impassioned speech to them before they boarded the ship. The Pilgrims, who were little more than political refugees, set up a Geneva-style Calvinistic theocracy known as the American Colonies and this was the spawning grounds for colonial Calvinism.

Not long after, in Salem Town and Salem Village, the infamous Salem witch trials occurred. The Puritan Cotton Mather was heavily involved and attended the execution of Salem Town's pastor, George Burroughs, who was accused of aiding and abetting a coven of witches. An actual account of the sad proceedings follow:

George Burroughs was executed on Witches Hill, Salem, on the 19th of August, the only minister who suffered this extreme fate.

Though the jury found no witches' marks on his body he was convicted of witchcraft and conspiracy with the Devil. While standing on a ladder before the crowd, waiting to be hanged, he successfully recited the Lord's Prayer, something that was generally considered by the Court of Oyer and Terminer to be impossible for a witch to do. After he was hung, Cotton Mather, a minister from Boston, reminded the crowd from atop his horse that Burroughs had been

convicted in a court of law, and spoke convincingly enough that four more were executed after Burroughs. Below is the original account as first compiled and published in 1700 by Robert Calef in More Wonders of The Invisible World, pages 103-104, and later reprinted or relied upon by others including Charles Wentworth Upham and George Lincoln Burr,

Mr. Burroughs was carried in a Cart with others, through the streets of Salem, to Execution. When he was upon the Ladder, he made a speech for the clearing of his Innocency, with such Solemn and Serious Expressions as were to the Admiration of all present; his Prayer (which he concluded by repeating the Lord's Prayer) was so well worded, and uttered with such composedness as such fervency of spirit, as was very Affecting, and drew Tears from many, so that it seemed to some that the spectators would hinder the execution. The accusers said the black Man [Devil] stood and dictated to him. As soon as he was turned off [hung], Mr. Cotton Mather, being mounted upon a Horse, addressed himself to the People, partly to declare that he [Mr. Burroughs] was no ordained Minister, partly to possess the People of his guilt, saying that the devil often had been transformed into the Angel of Light. And this did somewhat appease the People, and the Executions went on; when he [Mr. Burroughs] was cut down, he was dragged by a Halter to a Hole, or Grave, between the Rocks, about two feet deep; his Shirt and Breeches being pulled off, and an old pair of Trousers of one Executed put on his lower parts: he was so put in, together with Willard and Carrier, that one of his Hands, and his Chin, and a Foot of one of them, was left uncovered.

—Robert Calef

Now, in our day, and unbelievably, the proud children of this Calvinist legacy pronounce themselves the experts on “biblical manhood and womanhood.” Specifically, an organization was formed in 1987 called “The Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood.” It is funded, organized, maintained, and directed by the who’s who of the American Neo-Calvinist movement including Ligon Duncan, Wayne Grudem, John Piper, and Al Mohler. They formed a statement/declaration on this subject called the “Danvers Statement.” It is called the Danvers Statement because their declaration was finalized in—get this—Danvers, Massachusetts.

So, what is relevant about that? Well, Danvers is the modern-day location of Salem Town, the location of the Salem witch trials. In fact, these men made it a point to have the meetings there that finalized the document.

Furthermore, the Reformers didn’t get up one morning and decide to start burning witches—it all began with their Eve doctrine. And the proponents of the Danvers statement not only swear by the theological genius of Calvin, but what they teach about the fall and Eve’s participation is word for word. Also, regarding treatment of women presently in the church, all that is missing is the gallows. Whether it be<sup>12</sup> women locked in basements as punishment, being spanked by their husbands, deprived of education, or their children being held hostage through manipulation of relatives by church elders—it is at least Witch-Hunt Light.

The church is just another worldly kingdom saturated with division, closets full of skeletons, and political intrigue. The ecclesia has no fellowship with it, but what is our status here on earth if our kingdom awaits in heaven? The point is almost too simple: the Bible calls us "ambassadors" (2 Corinthians 5:20). What is an ambassador?

An accredited diplomat sent by a country as its official representative to a foreign country.

An official envoy; especially: a diplomatic agent of the highest rank accredited to a foreign government or sovereign as the resident representative of his or her own government or sovereign or appointed for a special and often temporary diplomatic assignment. An authorized representative or messenger. An unofficial representative traveling abroad as ambassadors of goodwill.<sup>13</sup>

The Bible uses other designations that demonstrate the following: the church is not our kingdom. We represent our own kingdom in heaven, and in our kingdom, we are all individual priests of a "holy nation."

1 Peter 2:9 - But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for his own possession, that you may proclaim the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light.

Once again, notice the group designation is chosen, or the means is chosen, and not individuals. We are His elect priests of a holy nation because we accepted the invitation to the wedding feast. Our priesthood refers to our bodies now being the temple of God, more accurately the Holy of Holies referring to being born anew. Hence, we are also...

1 Peter 2:11 - Beloved, I urge you as sojourners and exiles to abstain from the passions of the flesh, which wage war against your soul.

What is a "sojourner"? It refers to a temporary stay somewhere. An exile is a person displaced from one's homeland. Christ Himself said, "My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would have been fighting, that I might not be delivered over to the Jews. But my kingdom is not from the world" (John 18:36). Regarding the so-called Lord's Table, Christ said, "I tell you I will not drink again of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom" (Matthew

26:29). Our very breaking of bread and raising of the cup testifies that we are not of this kingdom or the church kingdom founded in the 4th century and married to the governments of this world. Borrowing the saying, "You can take the boy out of the country, but you can't take the country out of the boy, let us also say, America might have taken the church out of the state, but you can't take the state out of the church.

By its own admission via its Dominion theology, the church is here as a kingdom among many to take over the world for God. Part and parcel with this will be an investment in infrastructure that competes with other worldly institutions. This whole idea that God's kingdom is here presently drives the church to ape the world in everything while labeling every assimilation as "Christian." Apart from innumerable religious political parties, they seek to Christianize "every corner of the earth and human existence for God's kingdom"<sup>14</sup> Hence, we have Christian plumbers, bakers, musicians, comedians, lawyers, baseball players, you name it. The goal is to Christianize every corner of reality.

Instead of being goodwill ambassadors who represent God's kingdom and strive to adorn it with our love and good works, the church is here claiming to represent God as just another kingdom among many with a conquest mentality. Its goal, as stated orthodoxy, is to take over every vestige of culture, whether art, education, or government. Yet, Christians are dismayed at the persecution they endure in countries like China.

Has anyone ever given thought to the idea that competing kingdoms don't have a problem with God per se, but are leery of people who come as conquistadors and not ambassadors? How often is openness to the gospel shut down by the fear that the church simply wants to come in and start a coup d'état for God's glory? And unfortunately, the fear is most likely valid.