

Shabat Study January 22, 2021, by Yada

Please Note: I have transcribed this to the best of my ability. Sound bites of parties speaking simultaneously and those which were inaudible to me have been deleted from the transcript. If I guessed at a word, it was followed by ()? A _____ (blank line) indicates I could not understand the word or phrase and three periods ... indicate an interruption in the dialogue of one party by another. Thank you for your understanding. MK

Well, good evening. Welcome to Yada Yah Radio. We're here with Kirk this evening. Kirk, before we got on the air, I shared that I came up with something today that was one of those days where your eyes go big and wide, and you say oh my this has been there all the time and I'm just now stumbling upon it. So, I'd like to begin the program by sharing something that I wrote today and then we'll go from there back into Yada Yahowah Chapter 3, 'Ishah - Woman.

Today I'm rewriting the eleventh chapter of the second volume of *Questioning Paul*. The rewrite of the first volume of *Questioning Paul* is now available at Amazon. It's got a cover of a wolf in sheep's clothing that Jackie found, and is called *Liars Lie*. It's got a lot of new material and it looks beautiful in the new dress. In addition to that we've got the third book of *Yada Yahowah* Volume 3, which is called *In the Covenant*. It follows *In the Beginning*, *The Story of Man*, and then *In the Covenant*. So, we have three volumes now of *Yada Yahowah* and one now of *Questioning Paul*. I think it's the 12th book that we have now completed in the rewrite and then the last chapter of Volume 2 which then will be ready in probably a little over a week at Amazon. Normally I would finish a chapter in a day, but this chapter I'm now on my third day on it and it'll have another day and then I'll end up having to write probably another 30 or 40 pages in Volume 4 based on what I learned. So, I finished with the translation. Here's the lead in...

Having dismissed the Towrah and its Covenant, there is no longer any merit to circumcision according to Paul which Yahowah had stated was an everlasting sign of His eternal Covenant and therefore the Nestle-Aland (I use the Nestle-Aland along with the King James and the New Living translation throughout *Questioning Paul* in addition to my own translation) but the Nestle-Aland Interlinear is probably the most scholastic and most literal rendering of anything in the Christian New Testament. And so as bad as Paul writes and as illiterate as he is, it's nice to have a scholastic tool that reads as he wrote it so that people don't look at my translations and say well that doesn't flow very well. It doesn't flow very well because Paul doesn't write very well. Okay. So, here's the Nestle-Aland literal translation. It says:

“As many as for unto Christ were immersed Christ put on.”

Documented more comprehensively this becomes, I have to tell you it's incredibly sad and I apologize for this, but I actually now understand Paul's speech. When Paul writes something, I now understand what he's trying to say. That's embarrassing to admit but it is nonetheless true. All right, this is what Paul wrote. This is my translation of it:

“Because (gar) as many as (hosos) to (eis) Christon (XPN), you all were actually at some point baptized (baptizomai – you all were dipped, immersed, and / or really submerged without process or plan by the actions of another (aorist, passive, indicative)), Christon (XPN) you were all

clothed or plunged (enduo – you were all dressed and put clothing on; from en – in and duno – go into or sink into, being plunged (aorist (occurring at some point in time without regard to a plan or process))

It probably should be “you” even though he didn't have his tenses correctly. Let's just help him a little bit here. “...**you were all clothed or plunged**” - *baptizomai* is the word that Paul chose.

Now, it struck me that this was probably the first time in Christendom that the concept of baptism had ever been spoken of. If you're reading your Christian New Testament, you wouldn't think that because you'll find it mentioned with John the Baptist in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Luke turns John the Baptist into the most elaborate fairy tale you ever heard. His entire first chapter is on the miraculous signs and wonders of John the Baptist. He is the second coming of Elijah. He has a prophetic declaration from Gabriel. And when his mommy and the mommy of Jesus met Little John the Baptist, he's up in his room. It is so sweet. Of course, it's all nonsense. Then there are verses with a conflicting account in the Gospel of John because in the Gospel of John, John is not called a Baptist. In addition to that guess who is not baptized. Jesus.

I thought that even though his baptism is mentioned in Mark that this was the first time baptism was ever associated with the new religion of Christianity. Turns out I was not only right but what my wife found, because I said, “This is my instinct. My instinct tells me here that not only was this the first time that baptism was ever associated with the religion of Christianity and that Paul is doing it because he wants to annul circumcision as the sign of the Covenant but there was a pervasive well-known religious entity celebrating the rite of baptism in Israel at the time that this moron copied. Could you find it for me? I just know it's there.” Well, it isn't just there. Christianity is based on it. It is the most amazing thing that I think we have ever stumbled into so let me read what I wrote, and we'll go from there. I'm not going to get into all of it, but I do want to share some of it because it is so earth shaking.

There is no purpose or benefit to baptism. A bold statement. There is no purpose or benefit to baptism. According to God (and He ought to know) there is no association between baptism and participation in the Covenant. Entry into heaven, the remission of sin, our Salvation. It is among the Pagan practices Yahowah asked us to avoid. If baptism had a counterpart in the Torah Naby' wa Mizmowr it would have had a Hebrew equivalent. But there is no such word or concept in the language God used to convey his message to the world.

Yahowah asks us all to wash our hands. Parents do that to their children regularly. Don't they? And while in the wilderness, He asked those entering His Tabernacle to wash their hands and their feet. And in the mode of a caring father, He instructs us to wash our clothes at appropriate times, especially when around contagious individuals, whereas we know He also encouraged us to wear a face mask. These references to cleansing are about hygiene and are never presented as a substitute for circumcision. Baptism has become Christianity's signature rite. It is used instead of circumcision to demonstrate admission and acceptance. It was introduced into the religion for the first time with these words from Paul's pen.

The Greek word “baptizo” was in common use when it was first penned by Paul in Galatians and thereafter by Mark, Paul's associate. Before we consider its religious and etymological history,

however, I would like to demonstrate how Paul used Mark to promote his agenda, so that we properly credit baptism's syncretism into Christianity to Paul and to Galatians 3:27.

Our quest to know "John who was called 'Mark'" begins in Acts 12:12 where Shim'own Kephas | "Peter" is shown visiting with him after a mal'ak | spiritual messenger freed the disciple from Herod's custody. However, Sha'uwl absconds with him immediately thereafter in Acts 13:5, making Mark part of the imposter's posse by Acts 13:13. When next we see Mark it is in Acts 15:37-39, where the aspiring "Gospel" writer was wavering and ready to take leave of Paul along with Barnabas (who happened to be his cousin). "But Paul kept insisting otherwise, that those who had deserted him not take him." (These are quotations from the Acts of Paul) "And there arose such a sharp disagreement that they separated from one another, and Barnabas took Mark with him and sailed away." Paul, however, did not handle desertion well, especially since Mark and Peter, Paul's nemesis, had become friends.

The trail runs through Colossians 4:10-11, where we find that Paul prevailed and once again had Mark back in his clutches, wrenching him away from Peter and Barnabas. In his letter to the Colossians, we find Paul saying: "Aristarchus, my fellow prisoner sends you his greetings, and Barnabas' cousin, Mark, about whom you received instructions if he comes to you. Welcome him and Iesou, who is called 'Justus.' These are the only fellow workers for the kingdom of God who are from the circumcision, and they have proved to be an encouragement to me."

In Philemon 24, Mark is listed along with Luke as "my fellow workers." This leads to 2 Timothy 4:10-11, where in the last words Paul would write in his final letter: "alone, only Loukas | Luke is with me, Markon | Mark having been taken (analambano – carried off and led away). Bring (ago – lead, guide, and/or carry) him with you because (gar – indeed, used to provide an explanation and express a cause) he is to me useful (euchrestos – highly serviceable and very profitable, exceedingly easy to make use of) for the purpose of (eis – the intent and result of) my ministry (diakonia – to serve and support me, and to make my preparations following my commands)." Oh my, how is it that we've missed this all this time. Mark co-opted under very sinister circumstances to serve Paul. The word translated "useful" is euchrestos, a compound of "eu – good, prosperous, and well as in to be well off, doing well, well done, and beneficial," and "chrestos – suitable and eternally useful, fitted for service and beneficial." Chrestos is a spelling variant of chrestus, the title the earliest texts attribute to Yahowsha' and his followers instead of christos or christianos. It was unappealing to Greeks and Romans because Chrestus was commonly used as a nickname for their slaves.

Diakonia, the word translated "my ministry" is used 34 times in the Christian New Testament, all but one by Paul and his pals (Luke once, Acts 8 times, Romans 4 times, 1 Corinthians twice, 2 Corinthians 12 times, Ephesians, Colossians, 1 Timothy, and Hebrews once each, and 2 Timothy, twice). It serves to encapsulate Sha'uwl's mission and is synonymous with Pauline Doctrine. It is from "*diakonos* – raising dust" as in "moving around in a hurry."

And indeed, Paul used Mark to kick up considerable dust, writing the "Gospel" according to Paul which is known as "Mark" and became the basis of Luke and 98% of Mark is found in Matthew. And that is why they are all anti-Semitic and reflect Paul's sentiments. It is why Paul did not quote

from any of them, because Mark, then Luke, wrote their “Gospels” and the Acts of Paul per Sha’uwl’s directions immediately after his death. Matthew would follow by plagiarizing Mark and Luke some thirty years thereafter. (It is surprisingly common for men to swoon at the feet of psychopaths.)

Now that we know that Mark’s Gospel was written a decade or two after Galatians, and that it was done at Paul’s direction, let’s see if we can ascertain where Paul pilfered the concept of “baptizo – baptism.” That answer, while readily available, is embarrassing. It is used in the Sibylline Oracles, lines 160-166: “Ye miserable mortals, repent, baptize (baptizo) in living streams your entire frame with its burden of sin. Lift to heaven your hands in prayer for forgiveness and cure yourselves of the impiety by fear of God!”

...He...the concept ...

This explains Mark’s spurious presentation of “John the Baptist,” in which the corruption of the conflation of Yasha’yah / Isaiah, Mal’aky / Malachi, and Shemowth / Exodus reads eerily similar to the Sibylline Oracle account. Luke then begins his “Gospel” by embellishing Mark’s dubious account with the absurd claim that “John’s birth” was “miraculous” and even foretold by “the angel Gabriel to Zechariah” who claims that he will “come in the spirit and power of Elijah” to scold Yisra’elites. Then to buff the divine varnish, Zechariah’s wife, Elizabeth, is allegedly a “daughter of Aaron” and a “relative of Mary.” Both pregnant at the same time, “it came about that when Elizabeth heard Mary’s greeting, the baby leaped in her womb, and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit. And she cried out with a loud voice, ‘Blessed among women, blessed is the fruit of your womb.’” (Luke 1:40-42) While continuing to wax poetic for a considerable time, when it finally comes to presenting the fanciful tale of “John the Baptist,” Luke cites the account Mark had written at Paul’s behest.

Matthew’s account is also derived from Mark. But when we turn to the disciple Yahowchanan | John, after his famous “in the beginning was the Word...and the Word was God,” he transitions to “John,” saying that he “bore witness of him.” Curiously, however, there is no mention of “John” being the “Baptist” nor of him “baptizing” “Jesus.” The only use of baptizo is in the mouths of the Pharisees.

The reason for all of the fuss, is that without the invention of “John the Baptist” baptizing “Jesus,” there is no justification for the Christian rite. Moreover, apart from this fabrication, there is no other reference to “Jesus” being anointed with the dove, and thus being a Messiah. It is also the only time “Jesus” is referred to as the “son” by “God.”

Putting the concept of baptizo in the mouths of Jewish leaders is telling. Turns out that a Jewish religious sect composed the Sibylline Oracles, not only introducing the concept of baptism for the remission of sin, but also a plethora of other religious concepts that were incorporated into Paul’s letters. There is so much to them, and they are so indicting of Paul, we will detail the connection between the Sibylline Oracles, Jewish philosophy, Pauline Doctrine, and Christianity in what will become Volume 4 of Questioning Paul.

It is breathtaking. It is absolutely breathtaking. I mean the crucifixion scene all came from the Sibylline Oracles. John the Baptist same thing. Every place you look and there was some notable line or some notable event. Pilfered. I am so glad that we found Mizmowr 22 and 88 which provide an eyewitness account of what happened when Yahowsha' as the Passover Lamb fulfilled the Miqra'ey because the Sibylline Oracles absolutely rendered Christendom a complete and utter farce.

For now, it is important that we recognize that Galatians 3:27 is the first time that the pagan practice of baptism was presented in conjunction with Christianity. Second, there is no basis for baptism in the Towrah, although the religious rite was widely known to Jews as a result of their Sibylline Oracles – which were exceedingly popular at this time. Third, Yahowsha' | “Jesus” was not baptized. Fourth, the legend of “John the Baptist” was composed by Luke and is a fairytale. Fifth, Yahowsha' | “Jesus” never baptized anyone – including his disciples. Sixth, apart from Yahowchanan | John, and him attributing the concept of baptizo to religious Jews, something the Sibylline Oracles affirm, every other mention of baptism in the Christian New Testament was instigated by Paul, beginning with his associate, Mark, and then Luke. And seventh, the Sibylline Oracles were instrumental to Paul as he sought to distinguish his new Faith from Yahowah's Towrah. Baptism is just the beginning. When comparing the Gospels to the Oracles, there are so many common threads, even I was shocked.

There's more to it, but I just wanted to throw that out for today because talk about controversial. It is a gold mine. It is going to be one of the most challenging things I've done to step aside from the Sibylline Oracles and the amount that they were plagiarized into the Christian gospels into Paul's letters because I've still got to finish Volume 3. Volume 4 of *Questioning Paul* is going to be the sum of the things we learned about the history and where I shared a number of things in the book of Matthew and how it came into being anti-Semitic. Then I had the whole story of Paul's first speech where everything he said was a lie. Then we have the history of Christian translations as well as the history of how the books like Matthew, for example, got finished by Eusebius during the time of Constantine and how there's no prior history of any of the anti-Semitic comments prior to that time.

So, it's a really interesting study and we're going to put all of that new material that we came across after completing *Questioning Paul* in Volume 4. So, it's going to go from one volume to four volumes with the first volume done. The second volume, had it not been for the Sibylline Oracles and baptism, would have been done today. It'll take a little more time now to get through the final edit of it. But oh, my goodness. I just knew it had to be the case. So many of my Christian friends (that I finally had to abandon) in the early days that I was writing were always saying, “Well, you know that the baptism is a sign of the Covenant just like circumcision and both have their symbolism.” No. There is nothing in the Towrah, Prophets, and Psalms even remotely related to baptism. It's purely Pagan. So how about those apples? It's pretty astonishing when you work it all through.

This is the new introduction. I guess it's now Chapter 12 of Volume 2. It's called *The Middleman, Would you Believe?* It begins, Paul calls himself “The Middleman.”

His frayed emotions spent, Paul continued to flail in the air, taking sweeping swipes at God. Having not landed a solid blow, he became a tragic figure, tangled up in his pathetic flailing. He was a punch-drunk boxer, tottering in the midst of his tantrum.

Fueled only by ego and desperate to land the haymaker he craved, his vendetta against the Almighty devolved into madness. He continued to tamper with the evidence and bellow bombastic taunts as he mocked everyone, including God.

And yet through it all, completely detached from reality, he became the high-minded moral failure Yahowah had foretold 666 years earlier. Reflecting his Lord's overbearing attitude, Sha'uwil continued to present his attack on the Almighty as if he were a beacon of light in a dark world. The bad seed of 'Abraham was insane, and yet with every whiny breath, this lowly and little man would have us believe that he alone was imbued with the means to save mankind.

This would be his haunting refrain: God is wrong, Paul is right, Jews are bad, Gentiles are mine.

God is wrong, Paul is Right, Jews are bad, Gentiles are mine. That's the opening of Chapter 12. I am admittedly not a fan of Paul. And I cop an attitude. I love Yahowah. We are friends. I respect Him. I love Him. I admire Him. I enjoy His company, and the likes of Paul really piss me off. That is just the way it is. I despise him. And so, I am not impartial. All right. I got that off my chest. To me it has been a labor of love to go back into questioning Paul and to excoriate him.

We're going to turn now to Volume 2 called *Adam The Story of Man* Chapter 4 '*Ishah* – Woman ...it's called

So Much to Learn...

There is a reason for everything – good and bad, right and wrong, life and death. Our choices matter. There is always a consequence.

In this regard, Yahowah not only wants us to know that He created evil it is here in the Towrah that He explains why. One cannot choose good if bad does not exist. And for this choice to be credible, an Adversary has to be its champion. If everything were wonderful, if all of life were sunshine, there would be no reason to reject Yah or separate oneself from His love.

Heylel (sometimes written "Halal") ben Shachar, better known as Satan, is a spiritual being created by God. He was part of the "*tsaba*' – vast array of spiritual implements" Yahowah calls *malak* or "messengers" which He deploys on man's behalf. As we move out of *Bare'syth* / Genesis in the Towrah and into *Yasha'yah* / Isaiah in the Prophets, we will discover that this adversarial being wanted to be considered above the Most High, and thus perceived as if he were God. And while few things are as insightful, that is less important now than why he was allowed into the Garden.

Just think of that for a moment. That's the thing that everyone who is religious gets wrong about ha Satan the Adversary. They think that Satan worshippers; oh, they are the bad ones. Yeah. I don't want to be around those Satan worshipers. Satan despises Satan worshipers. The last thing that Satan wants is to be worshipped as the Adversary. It's as clear as the nose on our face. Satan wants to be worshiped as if he were God, so any reference to him as ha Satan the Adversary he wants to reject. So, when you read an attack on Satan in Christianity or Islam it's because Satan despises that title. He doesn't want to be the Adversary. He wants to be God, and when you recognize that

what you find is that Satan is the god, the Lord of Christianity, the Lord of Islam, the Hashem of Judaism. It's an exceedingly important point to draw home.

'Eden's transition from good to bad is very abrupt, and since context is the key to understanding, it's probably wise that we reassess how we got to this place. These are the statements regarding the Garden and the creation of 'Adam and Chawah that we had considered previously, which brings us to the time we are now.

“Yahowah, Almighty, relationally selected and grasped hold of the man named 'Adam and He settled him in the Garden of 'Eden to minister to her and to closely observe her, closely examining and carefully considering it. (*Bare'syth / Genesis 2:15*)

That tells you that man was outside the Garden, that a man was taken from outside the Garden and was placed into the Garden, and that man had a job to do. Yahowah loves work. **..to minister to her and closely observe her..** God wanted man to observe life within the Garden and then to interact with it. That tells you what our purpose is going to be in Eternity.

Then Yahowah, Almighty, provided direction concerning and on behalf of 'Adam, the man,
We have Towrah already. What is Towrah? Instruction and direction.

saying, 'From every tree of the Garden you can continually and actually eat, enthusiastically being fed and nurtured. (2:16)

Is there a restriction there? No restrictions of any kind.

But from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good, that which is beneficial and productive, correct and proper, favorable and enjoyable, desirable and agreeable, moral and right, valuable and worthy, even beautiful, generous, pleasing, pleasant, festive, and joyful, and Bad, that which is ineffective and counterproductive, errant and improper, disadvantageous and undesirable, disagreeable and immoral, both wrong and worthless, restrictive, displeasing, harmful, malignant, depraved, and saddening, do not make a habit of continuing to eat from it. Because as a consequence, within a day you will absolutely die defined by having eaten from it, coming to resemble what you have consumed.' (2:17)

So, you can even eat from the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Bad, and you can eat from it regularly. It's written in the imperfect. But there's a consequence. You can eat from it, you're free to eat of it, do so, but there's a consequence. If you eat from it, you're going to die. And you're going to be defined as having eaten from it. We know that because of the way the verb was written. It was a verbal adjective meaning that 'Adam is going to come to resemble the action of the verb which is to die. You're going to die resembling it. You're going to come to know what it means to die.

Okay, there are these are the instructions. Eat whatever you want. Understand though that there's one tree that if you eat of it there will be a negative consequence. It's your choice.

Yahowah, Almighty, said, 'It is not good, productive or beneficial for the man, 'Adam, representing mankind created in God's image, to exist alone or be by himself.

Isn't that insightful. God knows what the governors in blue states like California and Michigan can't figure out. Isolated, man is in real trouble. He becomes ..., he becomes paranoid, and suicidal. Suicide rates are way up, spousal abuse, alcohol abuse, psychiatric problems, drug abuse way up. Man does not function well alone. God says (big surprise here) man does not function well alone. We just don't. Now, I'm going to tell you I'm an extrovert. I'm an extrovert because I didn't like being an introvert. I was born an introvert and I'm here to tell you if you don't like what you are, you can change. You can. I was born an introvert and I didn't like it. You know why I didn't like being an introvert, the number one reason? Girls. Yes. Absolutely true. I think girls are really pretty; I have to tell you I like girls. Girls are worth the overcoming this. That was my motivation. The same motivation old 'Adam had here. Girls are pretty. Man is a social creature. It's not good, productive, or efficient for man to be alone. So, God says

I will engage and continually act on his behalf, producing a helper and supporter, one who assists and serves, a positive influence who rescues and renews like his corresponding counterpart, describing that which is straightforward, right for him, open to him, close by in his immediate proximity.' (2:18)

Pretty cool.

So, then Yahowah, Almighty, who fashioned and formed man out of the elements of the earth every living animal of the expansive environment in addition to every bird in the sky, brought them to 'Adam in order to witness and delight in what he would call them and how he would greet and welcome them, even if he would summon them and invite them to meet with him, approaching them.

So insightful here. So, God didn't start with woman. Although ... almost certain that woman and man without a neshamah were present among all of the life forms that God brought out of the area that extended beyond the Garden that He brought to 'Adam to see how he would interact with them. If you look at what God was interested in, God's interest was in this relationship He had with 'Adam. Because He was concerned about 'Adam, He wanted 'Adam happy. He was concerned about 'Adam's well-being and He knew that Adam needed company. Now I am a big fan of dogs. There is something about having a dog as company that I find very satisfying. But I will tell you that my dog is not nearly as satisfying as my wife. So, I understand why Yah would say let's try them all out. See what you like and how you interact with them. Yahowah's very proud of life. He should be. DNA is a superlative programming language; there are so many interesting variations. The functionality of life from the ways that smell, sight, taste, feeling, and hearing all work and then the process of us being aware of our environment and being able to respond to interact and communicate, what a marvelous thing. So, Yahowah wanted to celebrate life with 'Adam and to see if there was a life form that Adam might relate to and say hey this could be good. I've got nothing against having a pet platypus. Why not? Could be fun. I once had a pet sloth. It was pretty cool. I was in the Amazon at the time.

Therefore, for the benefit of the relationship and to reveal the proper path to walk to get the most out of life, everything 'Adam approached, welcomed, and encountered, designating by

name, that became the depiction and reputation of that living soul and conscious lifeform. (2:19)

‘Adam summoned and met with, greeting by name and proper designation all of the animals, the birds of the sky, and every conscious lifeform of the expansive environment. But there was not found for ‘Adam a helper and supporter, one who could assist and serve alongside similar to or right for him. (2:20)

If you don't have a conscience, if you don't have this ability to differentiate between right and wrong, if you can't make good judgments, you're just boring compared to someone who had that capacity which Adam did.

As a result, Yahowah, Almighty, caused the man, ‘Adam, to be anesthetized,

God is saying man can't be alone. I want to try every life-form I've created and we're going to have this great fun doing this and then Yahowah said yeah, there weren't any that were right for him. I'm going to take care of that. I'm going to create a companion for him. Now God at this point had a couple of options. One is God could preoccupy all of ‘Adam's time. If he was never alone and always with God, there would be no issue with the social deprivation. But would it be maybe a little much for both Yahowah and ‘Adam to have the relationship 24/7? What happened with the children of Yisra'el? Yahowah freed them from the crucibles of Egypt and was talking to them as a burning fire on the top of a mountain with His booming voice. They were overwhelmed and said please don't do that anymore. It's just way too overwhelming. If you're as diminished as we are from God presently 24/7 unfiltered God might be a little much. I'd like to try it, but you know, we have some examples here where God says no, that's not going to work for you. That's why by the time we are so close that we can down next to one another, we can go back to explore the universe together as buddy-buddy and father-son and we get the full McGillicutty, by that time Yahowah is going to have elevated, enriched, empowered, liberated, and enlightened us to the point that we're operating in seven dimensions. We are infinity times infinity times infinity times infinity greater than we are now and so not a big deal then. The difference between us and God will be actually quite small by God's own design where now it is quite considerable. So, that's one option. God could be 24/7 with ‘Adam. And God says, "No."

The second is He could expose ‘Adam to find him a pet kangaroo or orangutan or something that could be buddy-buddy. That didn't work either. So, the third was I can just let the man go crazy and spend time with him and I want to but that's not going to work out because in the time that I'm away from him he is going to go nuts. So, God said, yeah, I think what I will do is create a woman.

I was just working on the translation of Paul's next statement that there is no longer any distinction between men and women or between Jews and Helen's Greeks. Of course, with Yahowah there's a tremendous distinction. We Gowym are only associated with Yahowah when we are part of Yisra'el's world. We have to embrace what God intended for Yisra'el to be part of His family. So, we're nothing without Yisra'el and Yahuwdah! Yisra'el and Yahuwdah mean everything to God and they remain so to the very end. There's a tremendous difference between men and women particularly on the issue of circumcision. Women aren't circumcised; men are.

But I understand that Paul liked little boys. As for me, I as I told you I overcame shyness because I think girls are pretty. I like girls and no offense, Kirk. You're a nice guy, but I don't _____. The fact of the matter is that together there's synergism. We are much better together. It's not only pleasurable but beneficial. So, God created a woman to be the perfect companion for man. By doing so God did something really extraordinary. He gave man the opportunity to say, Hey God, bug off. I dig the woman. When 'Adam wanted to spend time with God now it was by choice because he had a really fun, enjoyable, and stimulating option back there wherever they nested in the Garden. So, that means the choice to be with Yahowah was real, genuine.

Powerful what God did and that just shows you how spectacular Yahowah is; how comfortable He is with Himself. Not only is He not commanding that we follow His orders; He's saying I'm going to give you a set up where if you want to ignore me go right ahead. I'm going to make it easy for you. If you choose to embrace Me, I'm going to make that wonderful for you.

As a result, Yahowah, Almighty, caused the man, 'Adam, to be anesthetized, falling deeply asleep, similar to being under anesthesia. And while he slept, He grasped hold of one of his ribs from his side and sutured up the place beneath it, replacing it with living tissue. (2:21)

Then Yahowah, Almighty, constructed with the rib, building for the purpose of the family and for procreation, establishing also for restoration that which to reveal the benefits of the relationship He had taken from the man, 'Adam, a woman for a wife. And He brought her to the man." (2:22)

Well, I would have said yahooza that is really neat! Either 'Adam was a lot more articulate or God helped him out so that we might understand the consequence of all of this.

Then 'Adam responded, 'This is the way to conduct one's life, the motivation to push forward and the persistent heartbeat of life, its essential nature out of my essence, a living being able to communicate intelligently for me to desire and to share positive thoughts. For this reason, she shall be greeted, welcomed, and called, "woman," because out of man she was taken. (2:23)

Oh man isn't that brilliant? This is the way to conduct one's life. I would agree with that. The motivation to push forward and the persistent heartbeat of life? Yes. It's essential nature out of my essence a living being able to communicate intelligently for me to desire and share positive thoughts? That's the best it can be. I am fortunate to say I'm enjoying everything that he just wrote.

For this reason, she shall be greeted, welcomed, and called, "woman," because out of man she was taken. (2:23)

Accordingly, therefore, a man shall leave his father and his mother and engage, becoming close with his woman. And they shall exist as a unified pronouncement regarding life and an uplifting declaration concerning living in the flesh. (2:24)

And the two, the man and his woman, were naked, and they were not ashamed, wrong, or bothered by it." (*Bare'syth* / Genesis 2:25)

Well, that's quite an attack on Christianity, isn't it? Because in Christianity Pauline Doctrine (sex)? is evil and God said they are right there naked, and it was good. I don't see, frankly, what women see in men, but I know the attractiveness and the beauty of a woman for God to say, hey guy, I created this, but you can't have it. You can look but you can't touch. What a sadistic way to go about it. No. God says it's beautiful, it's fun, enjoy. He never once said you shouldn't be a sexy ___. And His limitations on sexuality are so de minimis. Incest, Pedophilia, and rape are really bad, and don't take advantage sexually of a of a man when he's down. That's it. No sheepies, no sons and daughters, no moms and dads. This is pretty basic stuff. Right? Rape is really terrible; really basic.

Therefore, Yahowah selected 'Adam and placed him inside of the Garden of 'Eden such that he could consider it and care for it. Along the way, God provided instructions, telling 'Adam that he could eat whatever he desired. He explicitly explained, however, that there would be a self-defining and deadly consequence of continuing to eat from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Bad.

Thereupon, Yahowah announced that since it was not good for man to be alone, He would engage on 'Adam's behalf, assisting, helping, and supporting him. Initially, God did so by introducing man to the other lifeforms He had created, realizing that it would be a mutually enjoyable and enriching experience. However, since that ultimately proved inadequate, God created woman, the ideal companion, and brought her to the man. 'Adam demonstrated his appreciation and his linguistic aptitude, exuberantly and brilliantly encapsulating Yahowah's intent. The scene was even portrayed as sensual and uplifting. Now, in contrast to this (this is where we branch off into new material) we discover....

“The spellbinding serpent (*wa ha nachash* – so then the sorcerous snake, this venomous viper, and poisonous cold-blooded reptile, this tempting and toxic creature; from *nachash* – the one who enchants and captivates regarding the Divine, the one who practices divination, magic, and sorcery, who indulges in prophecy to capitalize by fortunetelling, invoking supernatural knowledge and power) **was** (*hayah* – existed as (qal perfect)) **cunning and clever** (*'aruwm* – shrewd and subtle while appearing sensible, crafty and obscuring, elusive and ambiguous with his counsel, highly skilled at being mischievous, abusive, and treacherous), **more so than** (*min* – distinguished in this way from) **any other** (*kol* – all) **lifeform** (*chayah* – living being, animal, wild beast, or supernatural creature) **relative to** (*'asher* – in relation to) **the broad and open way** (*sadeh* – the cultivated environment or great expanse of land [outside the Garden]) **that Yahowah** (𐤏𐤃𐤅𐤃𐤁 – a transliteration of *YaHoWaH* as instructed in His *towrah* – teaching regarding His *hayah* – existence), **Almighty** (*'elohym* – God), **had deployed** (*'asah* – had conceived or created, had enabled or engaged (qal perfect)).

Then he said to (*wa 'amar 'el* – so he spoke, verbally addressing, promising and claiming regarding) **the woman** (*'ishah* – the female), **‘So what if it were true that** (*'ap ky* – beyond all of this, even more than this, in contrast on the other hand, nevertheless upon the condition therefore that it was out of anger, furthermore demonstrating resentment and arrogance, with an inappropriate self-appraisal while emphasizing that it was indeed accurate that there was an exception) **God** (*'elohym* – the Almighty) **said** (*'amar* – stated and claimed, exclaimed (qal perfect)).

perfect)), **“You should not make a habit of eating** (*lo’ ‘akal* – you should not continually consume food, consistently being nourished by (qal imperfect – addressing actual ongoing, continuous, and habitual consumption)) **from** (*min* – part of) **any tree** (*kol ‘ets* – all and every plant) **of the garden** (*ha gan* – the cultivated and lush environment which is protected and conducive to life).””” (*Bare’syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:1*)

Isn’t that clever. **‘So what if it were true.’** Isn’t that interesting. **‘So what if it were true’** (*‘ap ky* – beyond all of this, even more than this, in contrast on the other hand, nevertheless upon the condition therefore that it was out of anger, furthermore demonstrating resentment and arrogance, with an inappropriate self-appraisal while emphasizing that it was indeed accurate that there was an exception). It does sound like a lawyer.

Then he said to (*wa ‘amar ‘el* – so he spoke, verbally addressing, promising and claiming regarding) **the woman** (*‘ishah* – the female), **‘So what if it were true that** (*‘ap ky* – beyond all of this, even more than this, in contrast on the other hand, nevertheless upon the condition therefore that it was out of anger, furthermore demonstrating resentment and arrogance, with an inappropriate self-appraisal while emphasizing that it was indeed accurate that there was an exception) **God** (*‘elohym* – the Almighty) **said** (*‘amar* – stated and claimed, exclaimed (qal perfect)), **“You should not make a habit of eating** (*lo’ ‘akal* – you should not continually consume food, consistently being nourished by (qal imperfect – addressing actual ongoing, continuous, and habitual consumption)) **from** (*min* – part of) **any tree** (*kol ‘ets* – all and every plant) **of the garden** (*ha gan* – the cultivated and lush environment which is protected and conducive to life).””” (*Bare’syth / In the Beginning / Genesis 3:1*)

A statement out of context with implications that were inaccurate.

While no doubt *nachash* | spellbinding, the notion of our Adversary being a “serpent” is merely symbolic. Satan is a spiritual being akin to light. His outward appearance is brilliant, radiant, and illuminating. While his approach is serpentine, and thus convoluted, by virtue of his immortality and enormous energy he cannot be trifled with as one would charm a snake. His words are venomous, and his interactions are toxic. In keeping with the metaphor, Satan inflicts those who listen to him with a neurotoxin, rendering his victim’s incapable of fleeing for their lives, paralyzing, blinding, and incapacitating them.

Satan is also a trickster, willing to provide all of the signs and wonders required to promote the poison pens of his apostles. And he can be enchanting, indeed, mesmerizing, giving the unsuspecting the impression that he is Divine, better even than God.

By using *‘aruwm*, we recognize that our adversary is “cunning and clever.” He “appears sensible even while being subtle and shrewd.” His counsel is deliberately ambiguous” because the truth is devastating to his ego. He is “highly skilled at obscuring his actual nature and intent.” God told us that. He’s very skilled at obscuring his actual nature because Satan doesn’t want to be Satan the Adversary. He wants to be God. God has been very clear with us; we just haven’t thought it through.

We ought not expect Satan to appear as an ugly reddish avatar with horns. The Devil would not fool anyone with such a routine. No, Satan has no interest in playing the role of Adversary. His every ambition, word, appearance, and deed are carefully calculated to cleverly conceal his adversarial nature such that we humans are seduced by him, tranquilized into believing that he is not only revealing the word of God, but is actually God.

For example, rather than overtly condemn the Towrah, rabbis misrepresented and misconstrued its intent in their Talmud. Even their Zohar alludes to the Towrah in the process of elevating Satan's appeal. Rather than acknowledge that he had been selected by Satan to undermine Yahowah, Paul claimed that the God, the very God that he was contradicting, had chosen him to be His lone apostle. As a result of this clever ruse, Christians would worship Paul's Lord as if Satan were God. They would even identify themselves with the macabre image of the 'Dead God on a Stick.' Similarly, Muhammad fooled billions when he modeled Allah after Satan and then claimed that he was God. And in the end, all three religions would seek to abuse and silence Yahowah's witnesses and corrupt His testimony. Clever, indeed.

The fact is, Yahowah created *ha Satan* | the Adversary. God allowed him to enter the Garden. He even introduced him to us, describing him so that we would not be similarly fooled by his ploy. Then, and this is important, Yahowah allowed Satan to misquote Him and thereby mislead humanity. When Christians say I can't believe that God would allow someone to corrupt His word, they just are not paying attention. In the second chapter of the first Book, He even gave the people He loved the opportunity to choose poorly – to respond in a manner that was hostile to their wellbeing.

KIRK: That would tell me that if you're not going to go back and read what He said then you don't have a chance. Go read what I said and now you can't be fooled. He even said the same thing about if the account is true of Yahowsha' in his farewell speech telling to look out for Paul. He's coming, the wolf is coming. They never look there; they won't look in the Towrah.

YADA: Yahowsha' said there's a wolf in sheep's clothing that's going to come to you and try to annul the Towrah; don't believe him. How much clearer can it be? Yahowah, 666 years before Paul penned Galatians, said that a fellow named Sha'uwl was going to be the plague of death. He's going to be overly fixated with circumcision. He is gonna claim Gentiles for himself. He's going to come at the time the Mow'ed are being fulfilled. He went on and on and explained exactly what he was going to be like. He talked about his ego and his circular reasoning, and we managed to ignore it.





We're going to start the third chapter of Bare'syth here in just a moment. But you had told me that you did some checking on the rather unusual claim that I made that I think this is one of the things that we've come up with that there are some rabbis over the past couple of thousand years that came to realize this is also true. I think you can find, it's like the thousand things we've deduced from Yahowah's word that no one is considered in 2,000 or 2,500 years. This is one of them that there actually are some rabbinical writings on. Again, my wife found them for me after we came to it. She said, "Yeah I read that 1,500 years ago some rabbis recognized the same thing, that of the Hebrew letters that are directional, all but one points to the left. Hebrew reads from right to



left. So, all the directions say go where the words lead; follow these words to their destination. And the one that goes the wrong way is the Gimal, the basis of Goy. God says don't follow in the ways of the Goy. He made the foot (that is the Gimal) go in the wrong direction. It's really brilliant.



You did a little study on it. I know that we don't have unanimity among Covenant members. I think Mike is one that says he thinks the plow is going the other way and one other letter that he doesn't concur with that. It's fine to have thoughtful disagreements. Mike has endeared himself to me a million times over. He is the world's best fact checker in these books and is hugely beneficial in his editing process. He does just a lot of great research, but this happens to be one of the places where he sent me his thoughts on it, and I don't concur, but I still have the utmost respect for his thought process. I think you have as well. Your views are fairly similar to mine that there's one letter that's going in the wrong direction. All the rest of them are going to the left following where the words lead.

KIRK: Yeah, and I'll send my notes to Mike and he can see my reasoning on it. I've got about two pages.

YADA: I want to make a statement here. Within our Covenant family, particularly with the thoughtfulness that someone like Mike displays, we actually encourage disagreement. I think it's a wonderful thing because we're not going to disagree on Yahowah's name or the nature of the Covenant. We don't disagree on anything that is material to Yahowah and our relationship with Him, but there's so many details that are inner woven into the story that there can be different interpretations of things and we can both be right. Or sometimes we're wrong and he may be right. So, this is not a bad thing. This is a very good thing. All right, go ahead, Kirk.

KIRK: I broke them down to the way I recognize these letters. There's nine of them that are going from right to left and one is going from the left to the right, which is a Gimal. Then I looked at the others. There's six that actually go up and down and I'm doing the directional line saying well, how does the flap work on the Pesach door (the flap of the tent) because that's what is drawn as and it's going up and down. And I started thinking well that's kind of like free will because you can go into the tent and out of the tent. You have a Hey  and a Quph  that can greet you or you can push somebody away from it. You can run open ... stop. You have an eyelid Ayin  which is perspective. It can be Yah's perspective or yours, but it goes up and down __ with lids it's over the eye as well as a mouth  of the Pey goes up and down as well.

Then you have, of course, you have the teeth  that part. They go up and down and biting which are symbolic of nourishment or poisonous food depending on what the words are, and then of course you have a Quph  which is a sun rising or sun setting. It could be the (adventure)? you're going to or the end of your life.

So, then you've got another six left and the six that are left I broke into two threes. You've got three that go laterally, in my opinion. The Hey  can walk to the left or to the right. It is drawn up right the Mem  water flows in the other direction. It is a wave, but it's not drawn going in any direction. It is just stagnant. __ with the opportunity to move.

YADA: It actually is not stagnant because it's waving so it ...

KIRK: Well, it's waving but it's not going one direction over the other.

YADA: It's got energy but it's not moving right to left.

KIRK: Right. And then you have something what are going to do with the Taw ☉ ? It can be two things. It could be another T or x marks the spot, but it's also drawn as a basket. Some people believe it is primarily a basket. When anything is a circle, and on its side, it can roll either way. So that gives something that tells me that the letters also I wrote can pertain a little bit to the imperfect because it is ongoing in whatever direction it is still ongoing. Then I'm left with ...

YADA: Any of those things can move either direction. Water can provide life, it nourishes plants and provides us with life, but there's probably nothing more destructive in our world. Like when you have a hurricane it's the water surf that is destructive. Floods are unbelievable.

KIRK: So that brings us down to three more and these I didn't have a directional line. I put them as stable. That seemed to be the most logical choice in my mind because you have a Chet ☐. The Chet is a fence, a protective wall. It could be the fencing part or all of the wall of a tent, like the sheepskin, but both are protective from storms or attacks, they're both protective and they also separate things.

YADA: There's no chance of them moving to the right or to the left, but the fence is a barrier. It's either keeping you out or keeping you safe inside. So, you have motion, it's just not moving to the right or to the left. It is something like forward and back. You are either protected inside of it or you're on the outside looking in being prohibited from entering.

KIRK: Okay. Now we're down to two we need to view and figure out. A tent peg which is the Waw ׀. It increases the size of a tent, and also stabilizes the tent, and it represents the family. It is stable up and down. And then, of course, my favorite of all is the upright pole, the Taw † which holds up the Tent of the Witness. I categorized these as things that can be trusted and relied upon is my positive take on these three letters.

YADA: All three of those are things that cannot move right or left. Everything else can move right or left, but not those; they are all set.

KIRK: All things have movement but not those. They are stable as can be. You can count on them. So, I'll send a copy over to Mike and see what he thinks.

YADA: I think his thing was it has a person laying down and their feet is off to the right. The head is to the left. I viewed it as left-leaning because it is leaning back, and I view it as the head is the operative part. And if you are laying back your eyes are facing to the right, and as I look at it the person's head is directionally oriented to the left side. And then the plow ☞ the way that I looked at the plow it looked to me like the plow is to be pulled from right to left for it to till the ground, the way the letter is. But again, you can have different opinions on that and again those two letters are not among the most important. So, the two that were questionable to him don't take away from the overall insights that you can derive from all the others.

The conclusion to me of all of this was that the Hebrew letters direct us to go where the words lead. When I started this that was the overwhelming thought that I had from God; go where My words lead. This is not complicated. Figure out what I said and go where the words lead. They may lead to places that you just never thought possible. You may not even like initially that I'll cause you some heartburn but trust Me on this. If you go to where My words lead it's going to turn out good in the end. You're going to be very satisfied. You're going to be enlightened. You're going to see how the whole picture fits together. Just please have the courage to go where My words lead. So, when I see these letters leaning from right to left, the way that Hebrew reads, that's what struck me about these words where Yahowah says specifically don't go in the way of the Gowym and of course the most important G word is Gowym and ... the opposite side.

So that's the ... drive from why it worked for me and it if doesn't work for you, that's okay. But that's it. That's an interpretation. So, we're not here trying to analyze what God said. We're just looking at the language that He used the letters and saying isn't this an interesting insight that we think can be derived from it. You also looked at some of the numbers and then how they relate to Yahowah's name. This one I have never heard before so I'm ...

KIRK: Well, I'd never seen it before either, but I was reading it and I thought to myself because to paraphrase something that is in this chapter you were talking about that if you want to be like Satan, I'm paraphrasing, don't use Yahowah's name.

YADA: If you read further down, Satan never uses Yahowah's name.

KIRK: We know the rabbinic types are going to change His name. They're going to use Hashem and ___in so many different ways, but I've never thought about this, and this also kind of helps to prove that the pronunciation of Yah's name is Yahowah. If you do the numbers if, you write numbers in Hebrew, and I'm going by source here. One through nine are Aleph through Tet. When you get to 10, you have a double-digit number. So now you have to write it and then you would write Yah Aleph which would be Him plus 1. If you want to write, I'm looking at the current modern Hebrew school; it makes more sense to me. You want to do say 23 you would have to write quph ~~⊖~~ gimal ~~Ⓛ~~. However, you've got two numbers that you can't write. They do that consistently all the way through 10 + 1, 10 + 2, 10 + 3 / 11, 12 13 14 and same thing with 20, the same thing with all the numbers except all of a sudden, you've got two exceptions that they cannot use. They are the numbers 15 and 16. If you write the number 15 you write Yah. If you write the number 16 you write Yahahowah. That is too close to Yahowah, so they changed it from 15 from Tet ⊗ Wah Y (⊗Y) and they write it as for 16 (which is 9 + 7), they write it as Tet ⊗ Zayin ~~Ⓜ~~ (⊗Ⓜ). You have to work really hard to get rid of Yahowah's name.

YADA: Wow, they are really that insistent in hiding Yahowah's name!

KIRK: Yes, and you can't even accidentally fall on it.

YADA: They are really devious.

KIRK: You ain't kiddin'.

YADA: Obviously, there was a rabbinic Jew somewhere back there that thought this through and said yeah, we can't have one and five, we're going to have one and six just to avoid saying Yah. And Yahu, which so many of the names like Yasha'yah is really Yasha'yahu, Yirma'yah is really Yirmayahu. There are so many names that have the Yud and the Waw that they will do anything to keep your ...

KIRK: It just blows me away.

YADA: That's really clever. I was unaware of that. Thank you for that, Kirk. All right, we've got a few minutes left. Let's start into Bare'syth 3:1.

That is considerably divergent from the statement that Yah makes, let me read this to you.

But God did not leave His creation ill-equipped. He had provided clear instructions:

Keep in mind, these are Yahowah's instructions. We read them earlier, but just so that it's fresh in our minds....

“Then Yahowah, Almighty, provided clear instruction and direction on behalf of ‘Adam, saying, ‘From every tree of the Garden you can continually and actually eat, enthusiastically being fed and nurtured. (2:16) But from the Tree of the Knowledge of Good, that which is beneficial and productive, correct and proper, and Bad, that which is ineffective and counterproductive, disadvantageous and undesirable, do not make a habit of continuing to eat from it. Because as a consequence, in a day you will die defined by having eaten from it.’”
(2:17)

So, that's God's statement.

That is considerably divergent from the statement Satan attributed to Yahowah. In academic circles, this ploy is called “revisionist history.” In debate, it's called a “straw man.” The Adversary's whitewash of Yahowah's Word was a clever corruption or counterfeit, which is the most effective way to convince people that a fraud is true. **“Then [Satan] said to the woman, ‘So what if it were true that God said, “You should not make a habit of eating from any tree of the garden.”’”** (3:1)

Well think how different that is. **“You should not make a habit of eating from any tree of the garden.”** What God said is you can make a habit of eating from every tree in the Garden, didn't He? What Satan says is **so what if God said**, and then he did as he inspired Paul to do, which was to imply with a bogus citation the opposite of what God said. Rather than God restrict (them)? saying you can't eat from every tree in the Garden God says you *can* eat from every tree in the Garden. That's the first statement. You can continually eat from every tree in the Garden, but Satan's promise was **‘so what if God said you should not eat of any tree in the Garden?’** His comment was the antithesis of what God said. But there were so many words in common that the counterfeit was suddenly credible. He didn't come into the Garden and say hey, I have conceived that most spectacular tree in the history of fruit trees. I've invented the Apple computer. You aren't going to believe what this sucker will do. That's what I have invented. And if you take advantage of My invitation, you are going to find life so much richer. That would be convincing, wouldn't

it? I invented this thing. I'm offering you this thing. My thing is better than God's thing but that's not what Satan said. Satan instead grew his credibility by misquoting God, by coming up with a line that was similar in every way except it was negated. One small difference. Otherwise, it was exactly the same but he's inferring the exact opposite. So, Satan is gaining all of his credibility by usurping Yah's testimony. That's the opposite of creating an alternative from _____. That's what Paul did. Paul is saying is that God, He's the one man. He's the one that authorized me and then every time that Paul wanted legitimacy. He turned to the Towrah and misspoke. An exceedingly important aspect of religion particularly Christianity, Islam, and Judaism.

In actuality, 'Adam was told: **“From every tree of the Garden you can continually and actually eat.”** There were no restrictions placed on 'Adam. He could eat whatever he desired and saw fit. Moreover, had there been a restriction, the negation was not on eating from any tree as Satan had misrepresented. There was simply a deadly (read venomous and toxic) consequence of being defined by digesting something invalid and disagreeable.

There were no restrictions, just beneficial results and negative consequences of the options before him. And this was not an “if you make one mistake, I'm going to kill you” scenario. “*Akal* – eating was spoken in the imperfect which describes ongoing and habitual behaviors. This was parental advice, not a lord's command.

Satan inferred that he “*ap ky* – knew something beyond all of this, even more than this,” which is to infer that his knowledge was superior to God's. But in actuality, Satan's approach was “*ap ky* – in contrast” with God's. He was “*ap ky* – the other hand,” the “nevertheless upon which this exception, this new condition” was being foisted.” Born “*aph* – out of anger, arrogance, and resentment,” Satan would “inappropriately emphasize that his self-appraisal was indeed accurate,” when it was as phony as Paul's epistles, Akiba's arguments, and Muhammad's recitals.

No one would be fooled by a red, six-dollar bill with a picture of a hideous spiked-tailed and horned devil with a pitchfork. Although, most have no problem with “In God We Trust” inscribed on a promissory note, and thus a debt instrument, depicting a sun-god religion by way of an Egyptian pyramid and the Eye of Horus. Maybe people would be fooled by a six-dollar bill with a spiked-tailed horned devil.

The thing we want to keep in mind is the closer the lie is to the truth the more deceptive and beguiling it becomes. A counterfeit bill remains fraudulent and illegal even when it is 99.99% consistent with the original article. It artificially gains credibility in the eyes of the unwary through feigned similarity. It keeps Christians tied up in their underwear.

Created without the capacity for freewill, Satan is devoid of creativity. His lone ploy is to beguile by concealing, corrupting, or counterfeiting something God has already conveyed. And that is why the Lord's most popular religions are twisted variations of the truth. The more they claim the Towrah for themselves, as do Christianity, Judaism, and Islam, the greater their appeal. The more they misappropriate and misapply the word of God, the more readily they are believed.

Should you be wondering how Satan could have rebelled if he did not have freewill, I would encourage you to consider the circumstances under which we have the capacity to choose without

the right to do so. For example, the military is a command-and-control institution (as are Yahowah's *tsaba'* of *mal'ak* | regime of spiritual implements) where soldiers do not have the freedom to refuse an order. As was the case with Satan, insubordination in the military is unacceptable and is severely punished, with the noncompliant stripped of their rank and incarcerated. People have long chosen to be pedophiles, rapists, arsonists, thieves, and murderers, but have never had the right to do so.

Yahowah gave 'Adam and Chawah, and indeed all men and women, freewill. We can choose to ignore Yahowah's instructions without penalty. Those who do, like all animals, eventually die, their souls ceasing to exist. God neither pursues them nor judges them. He assuredly does not punish them. That was the cause and consequence of the instruction to 'Adam regarding the Tree of Knowledge.

That was the cause and consequence of the instruction to Adam regarding the tree of knowledge. If you eat from it, you're going to embody what it means to die. He's not going to punish you. In fact, Yahowah says, these are the consequence of you doing that, it gives three. They're not punishments. Not at all. Just a consequence if you do this. This is the consequence. You make your choice, and you live with the consequences.

The *mal'ak* | messengers, however, exist as spiritual envoys. They are God's implements, tools He uses to interact with His creation. The potter's wheel does not have a life of its own. It does not decide when to run or what to make. And most importantly, the potter's wheel would be considered broken should it become insubordinate – or worse: claim superiority over the one wielding it.

Moving on, the second element of the Adversary's plot to mislead Chawah was to suggest: **“so what if God said...!”**

His inference was pretty ballsy, huh? I've spent the last month in Pauline Christianity and that's the epitome of it. So, what if God said but I Paul say. His inference was of course that Yahowah words do not matter. The interesting thing is that Satan is far more respectful of God than was Paul. Paul calls Yahowah's testimony pornography. He calls God a mean-spirited antiquated slave master. He says that God's words can't save anyone; in fact, when he has his *Cristo* die his *Cristo* does not die to save us from sin. His *Cristo* dies to save us from the Towrah. Paul is so much more disrespectful of God and His Towrah than Satan. That's part of why Satan probably had _____. Neither of us like God, but after all He is God. Take a chill pill here pal.

This ploy forms the basis of Catholicism's condemnation of those who are “Sola Scriptoria.” Popes consider themselves authorized to alter, even completely change, God's directions. It is the basis of the “Oral Law” where the claim is that G-d handed the written Towrah to Moses while the people created their own oral variation. In Socialist Secular Humanism, man claims God never existed, making mankind the ultimate authority, and thereby rendering Yahowah's message moot. In Islam, Allah was modeled after Satan, so everything Yahowah said was completely contradicted. Rabbis were especially cunning, openly claiming Yah's authority for themselves by outvoting and over-shouting God.

It has become a popular appeal. “*So what if God set the Sabbath apart, we want Friday, or Sunday, or the weekend,*” as the case may be. “*So what if God invited us to observe the seven Miqra'ey, we*

prefer Easter, Ramadan, Hanukah, or May Day.” “So what if God chose the name Yahowah, we prefer Mother Nature, Evolution, Ha Shem, Allah, Jesus, Jehovah, Buddha, or the Lord.”

As you travel along life’s way, and you confront a tradition or teaching that is somehow attributed to God, ask yourself: *Has God said this?*

That was the issue when I confronted baptizo in Paul’s letter the first time of course is written anywhere in Christendom. What was my first response? Did God say this? Is there any place that Paul could claim God said this? Paul was spectacular at misquoting God when it came to baptism, he didn’t even make the attempt. Why? Because there’s nothing related to it that he could twist. Ask yourself has God said this or as the case with the Talmud, New Testament, and Quran is what is being claimed a corruption or counterfeit of something God actually stated? In the process of fooling Chawah Satan exposed a test that we can all use to avoid being fooled ourselves.

Kirk, that’s probably a good spot for us to take a break from today’s program and we’ll pick right up with this next week. I will tell you that, and you’ve I’m sure now read this chapter, there’s a lot in this chapter, so much I had never seen before that all of a sudden just appeared, so obvious, and some things that are just shocking. Things that I learned about Chawah and ‘Adam. Even here as we’re talking about ha Satan, there’s some insights that are laid out right for us that are so useful, valuable, and insightful, and God’s interaction with them. Even things like you read a Bible and you say the penalty for Eve was pain in childbirth. It doesn’t say that at all. As a matter of fact, that exact same consequence and the exact same words are applied to ‘Adam and last time I checked ‘Adam isn’t having babies. So, it can’t be pain of childbirth if the same exact verb is used in reference to a consequence from ‘Adam. No, you find out God’s saying that raising children is going to be hard. You think you know what it’s like to do something difficult? Well, I’m going to tell you the most difficult thing you ever dreamed of was raising kids. Oh boy that ever true. So, He says, just listen, I’m raising you guys. I want you to know what it’s like. We’re going to learn a lot. We’re going to also learn a lot about the names that Chawah chose for her two sons, what those names mean and what the implications are.

Wow, and that’s even nothing until we get to ‘Abraham. Oh, my goodness. The stories that God has to tell us about ‘Abraham and we have to say why is He telling us this? Why do we all ignore it? Because it’s horrible. It’s really horrible. Why is God telling us this? Because clearly by the end ‘Abraham and Yahowah, other father and son, they are besties. God says, I know I made these promises to ‘Abraham and here 4,000 years later He’s honoring them, and He even introduces himself. I am the God of ‘Abraham. ‘Abraham got it together even though he was rotten.

Again, Yahowah is saying the people I choose to work with, they ain’t no prize. They got nothing to brag about. The closest person to have something to brag about was probably Dowd and yet he ___ ... yeah. That’s one of the things that people that aspire to be the center of God’s world to be used by God, I don’t think they understand that unless you are really deeply flawed you aren’t going to work for God. That’s His thing. You know, there’s so much value in it where you can say listen God’s not looking for you to impress Him. You can’t do anything that’s going to impress Him. He’s really far more interested in showing how His Towrah plan can perfect the imperfect. That’s what He’s about doing. He is about taking flawed implements and making them beautiful, making them shine, getting something useful and productive out of a dirty, dented tool. The title

that He uses to define the work that we're doing is Choter. It's an insignificant stick and if you don't like being called an insignificant stick then you ought not sign up. Right? The beauty of the whole thing is that you can relax because you know you're not doing this because you were super good or super smart or are somehow proved yourself worthy and you have to live up to a standard. The standard is really low, and anything ... I've got really good news for you. Well, maybe it's not such good news. Well, maybe you were chosen by God. Why did he pick me? Because you are really flawed. Okay. Was there anything else? Well, yeah, if you're willing to go where His words lead. ... He is God and His words are really smart. So how big a deal is it really? So, listen to Him and go where the words lead. You're not talking about the village idiot. He is God. He created the universe. He authored life. It really ought to be that impressive that you're willing to listen to it, right? It ought to be our privilege to listen to Him, not an accolade. To go where His words lead. Well, why not? He happens to be God. Whose else's words would you follow? I'm very comfortable in saying God is my buddy. We're friends. Okay, so He is infinitely greater and smarter, better and more powerful than you and I are but that's not how He approaches us. That's not how He interacts with us. He's very approachable, likable, and enjoyable to be around and yeah, we don't cop an attitude because we got nothing to brag about, but you can still be exceedingly relaxed with Him. If you goof, you just laugh it off. It's okay. We'll do better next time. It's a marvelous way that He had.

And even' Adam. Old 'Adam ditched his responsibility with the best of them. No, it wasn't my fault. That woman you gave me, it's her fault. It's not even the woman's fault. It's your fault, God. You gave me the woman and she told me to eat it. So, God it's your fault. If you hadn't made the woman, I wouldn't have this problem. It's not the best answer that he could have given. And, of course, the woman said it's not my fault. You let that serpent into the Garden, and he told me I could eat it.

It's just interesting how nobody wants to go where the words lead. No one wants to take responsibility. I'll tell you; life turns out better when you go where the words lead.

All right, Kirk. It's always fun. I enjoyed your research on the numbers, that's hilarious, and the and the letters contribution. We look forward to being with you next week Shabat Shalown.