

## **Kingdom or Church, Part 7**

Preached first on 8/11/2019 on [www.molibertyradio.us](http://www.molibertyradio.us)

Good morning, and thank you again for taking your valuable time to listen in to what I believe God has given me - through His Word - through His recorded Word - to preach the message of hope - that the Gospel of the Kingdom of God is available today - right now - for whosoever will may come - and walk in the Kingdom with the King of kings and Lord of lords.

Before I get into today's message, I need to give you an update on what was supposed to have been the final hearing before trials finally begin in the third week of what they call September.

The hearing was called a pre-trial conference and the judge was supposed to be making rulings on the motions that were outstanding.

Last fall - the fall of 2018 - I put in a document for the purpose of removing the judge. I have felt like from the very beginning that nothing in these trials has been fair. I have the cop against me, I have the persecutor against - and I have felt like the judge has been against me also. Not surprising since they all receive their paychecks from the same place. But, nonetheless, I have felt like they are all on the same side against. I understand the cop and the persecutor, but I have always been told that the judges in America are supposed to be impartial.

So the judge started the hearing on recusal and looked at me and said for me to present evidence. I'm not an attorney. I have no idea whatsoever as to what I am doing in that court room. I had no idea as to what evidence I was supposed to have - nor would I have known how to enter the evidence. You can't just talk to these people man to man. And they won't let you say anything unless you are saying the right kind of language at the right time. So, even though I had provided 14 reasons why I felt the judge was being prejudiced against me - I was now being told to offer evidence.

Look, I'm getting older. My mother tells me I am 57 years old. My hearing is not what it used to be. And the judge does not speak loudly. So there have been times where I thought it was my turn to talk and I didn't hear him - and he would just berate me and belittle me because I couldn't hear him. I told him that I had never one time been unkind to him but yet he had been unkind to me many times. Apparently that is not evidence of prejudice. So then I told him the main reason I had filed for his removal was because in a hearing last fall, he said to me, "I already know what you believe about our

laws." When he said that to me, I was shocked at his blatant admission that he had already made up his mind about me and seemingly all the cases. I told him that I had never told him what I believed about their laws. I told him that I told the cop that all I have ever done in my life is try to live by the Laws of God. Then, that cop took what I said and twisted into something I never said. I told him that when I tried to get the recordings of what I said to the cop - I was told that the recordings had been destroyed.

I told him that combined with how unkind I perceived he was to me and with that statement - I believe he is prejudiced against me.

At that point he said he would have to go back and read all the transcripts of the hearings to see if there was evidence of that. He then told his court reporter to go outside with him. A little while later he came back in and simply said, "That's all for today." So I got up and left.

When I got home, I looked up the docket online to see if there was anything updated. I saw something that said "Notice of entry mailed to DFT." Now, while I have never felt any kindness from the judge, the judge's secretary is different altogether. Each time I have contacted her, she has been very nice and has always called me by name - my only name - Charlie Steward.

I wanted to know what the Notice of Entry meant, so I emailed her and asked her if she would email me a copy of the Notice. This is exactly what I said in my email:

*Good afternoon, Mariah,*

*I see on the docket there is an entry called "Notice to DFT." I am assuming that "DFT" might be referring to me and it might be a notice from the court.*

*If this is true, would you please be so kind to email me that notice? If the notice is sent to me through the mail and is not addressed to me, I will be unable to open the mail. It is against my deeply held religious beliefs to answer to any other name than the name that I believe Christ gave me - and that is Charlie Steward. I'm not trying to be a "jerk" about this. I have explained this many many times. My name is Charlie Steward, and no other.*

*Thank you for your understanding,  
Charlie Steward*

Then the next morning I received a reply from her. She simply said:

*Mr. Steward,*

*As the referenced notices are generated by the circuit clerk, your request is being forwarded to their office for processing.*

*Sincerely,*

*Mariah Rapp*

*Secretary to the Presiding Judge*

Then, a few minutes later, I received an email from the Deputy Clerk of the court and it said:

*Greetings:*

*Documents will be mailed addressed to Charlie Steward today. For further reference, you may access filings from the Public Access Computer ;ocated in the Lawrence County Judicial Building.*

*Deputy Clerk,*

When I was brought before the current judge for the very first time, he looked at me and said, "I understand you prefer to be called Charlie Steward."

I told him that Charlie Steward is my only name. I have no other name, so, yes, I would prefer that he call me Charlie Steward.

He then said, (quote) "I will do the best I can to remember to call you Charlie Steward, and if I forget, you just remind me, and I will correct myself and call you Charlie Steward." (end quote)

Now, as he was saying this to me, understand that the persecutor was having a conniption fit. The persecutor refuses to accept that my name is Charlie Steward. They believe that a man cannot change his name unless he has gone to court to do so. I found out in the hearing this week, that they now believe that a man can change his name at common law, but can only do so under certain circumstances and they decided that there are circumstances that forbids someone like me from changing my name via the common law method. This is absolutely not true.

I'm going to make the following statement and please please do not misunderstand me. I do not claim to be an expert on much in this life. But I will tell you this - when it comes to teaching Fulfilled Bible Prophecy - I know what I am talking about. I have taught Fulfilled Bible Prophecy for over 35 years now and I know what I'm talking about when it comes to teaching Fulfilled Bible Prophecy. That is not arrogance, that is not pride. It's simply stating a fact that I have studied, pursued relentlessly, almost on a daily basis for over 35 years - the study of Fulfilled Bible Prophecy and the present day reality of the Kingdom of God.

On the topic of what a man's name is - I'll assure you this - there are not many people in America today that know as much about this subject as I do. Judges don't know the law of names. Lawyers do not know that law of names. Everyone in America assumes that the name your parents gave you - a name that appears on a birth certificate is your name. That is not true. When a man uses the name that his parents gave him - that is his name. But a man is not ever - not ever - bound to use a name that someone else has given him - even his own parents. The law for hundreds and hundreds of years - thousands of years - all the way back to Abram / Abraham - the law is that a man is free to call himself whatever he wants to. When he tells a man that his name is Charlie Steward - that's what his name is.

The persecutor in this county - like most people - does not understand a certain phrase related to names and name change. And it is this: "Absent fraud, a man is free to call himself whatever he wants to, and when the community acquiesces to that name, that becomes his name as much as if he was born with it."

They are basically trying to say that because I had a supposed tax lien from another state - originating in 1989 - that I had then lost the right to change my name via the common law - and so any use of any other name is felony forgery.

I provided them with their own missouri supreme court rulings and about 20 more from other states around America - showing them that this is not true.

For instance, on the Courts of Missouri website, there is a webpage called Name Change. I will put a link on my Audio page for you. When you click that link, you will see that Missouri recognizes common law name change as one of the three methods for changing names. Thank you, Missouri, but the truth is that about 99% of all name changes in this country occur via the common law - even yet today. For instance, every single woman that changes her name when she gets married - does so via the common law. When she announces to the community that she is taking her husband's name -

that becomes her name. It is not a marriage license. It is not a social security card - it is when she announces what her new name is.

When you look at the page on the Courts of Missouri website, you will see a paragraph on common law name change. You will see a reference to a Missouri supreme court decision from 1997 called Neal v Neal. You will see that the decision says "En banc" which means that none of the judges dissented - they all agreed.

In this decision, the court said:

*[...the court of appeals provided historical background of the common law right to change of name, regardless of marital status. The court noted that the common law and statutory methods of changing names coexist for the reason that no constitutional or statutory mandate has invalidated the common law.*

They went on to say:

*[Matter of Natale, 527 S.W.2d 402 (Mo.App.1975), controls disposition of the issue. In Natale, the Missouri Court of Appeals, Eastern District, provided a thorough summary of the common law and statutory rights to change of name.]*

Now, if you go look at this matter of Natale for a thorough summary of the common law and statutory rights to change of name, this is what you will find. This is a bit lengthy, but I want this information to get out. I want this to spread. We are not cattle. We are not subjects who are forced to use names that are registered with a state. If God impresses upon a man to change his name - just like he did Abram, or Saul, or Levi or on and on - then a man must obey His King and mere men cannot stand in the way. This is what was said in the matter of Natale. And, again, understand this clearly. It is not from the Missouri supreme court, or the eastern court of appeals in Missouri where I got the authority to change my name. I am only reading this today because even in men's courts - they should understand the history of names:

*[The thrust of petitioner's first argument is that she has the right at common law to change her name, regardless of her marital status. Section 1.010 (RSMo 1969, V.A. M.S.) adopts, as the common law of Missouri, the laws of England in existence prior to the fourth year of the reign of James the First which are of a general nature and which have not been invalidated, expressly or impliedly, by the United States Constitution, Missouri Constitution or Missouri Statute. A survey of the common law of England is, therefore, useful.*

*Surnames arose as descriptive terms applied to individuals to differentiate between parties with the same baptismal name, eventually becoming a required part of a person's legal name. Even so, names could be adopted and abandoned at will, and all members of a family, including the husband and wife, were not necessarily known by the same surname. Gradually, the custom that all members of the family bear the same, fixed surname developed as surnames lost their character as descriptions of particular individuals. Since the husband and wife customarily adopted the name of the spouse with the most property and since men typically held more property than women, most women took the husband's name. However, the custom never became law. The English common law view was that a woman's surname was not bound to her marital status and arose only through her use of a name.*

*The law of England adopted by Section 1.010, supra, recognized the right to change name by the nonfraudulent use of another. The right was never limited to males; indeed, it was through this common law method that a woman changed her surname to that of her husband after marriage. Cowley v. Cowley, (1901) A.C. 450, 460; 19 Halsbury, Laws of England (3d ed.), p. 829; 32 Md.L.Rev. 409 (1972); Lamber, A Married Woman's Surname: Is Custom Law?, 1973 Wash.U.L.Q. 779. As Section 1.010, supra, does not purport to prohibit married females from exercising their common law rights, married women in Missouri are free to adopt another name by the common law method if this right has not been invalidated by constitutional or statutory mandate.*

*This court is unaware of any constitutional or statutory provision which abrogates the English common law right to change names through usage, Section 417.200 (RSMo 1969, V.A.M.S.) notwithstanding. This statute provides that the transaction of business under a fictitious name not previously registered with the secretary of state is a misdemeanor. The construction given the statute comports with the common law right to change names. Contracts entered under a fictitious name are valid in themselves, but the act of contracting without registration constitutes a misdemeanor. [State v. Euge, 400 S.W.2d 119 \(Mo.1966\)](#). No holding in Missouri directly confirms the common law right to change names through usage, but the courts have indicated that a person's name is the designation given to the individual by himself or herself and others and that an individual may change his or her name. [State ex rel. Kansas City Public Service Co. v. Cowan, 356 Mo. 674, 203 S.W.2d 407, 408 \(Mo. banc 1947\)](#); [State v. Deppe, 286 S.W.2d 776, 781 \(Mo.1956\)](#); [State ex rel. Rainey v. Crowe, 382 S.W.2d 38, 42 \(Mo.App.1964\)](#).*

*Policy argues in favor of acknowledging that a woman may exercise the common law right to change names. The custom of restricting a married woman's right to use a surname other than her husband's is an outgrowth of societal compulsion and economic coercion inconsistent with developments granting women equal legal rights. The concept that the husband and wife are one, the "one" being the husband, has been*

*abandoned. Insistence that a married couple use one name, the husband's, is equally outmoded.*

*Petitioner chose to petition for a court ordered change of name under Section 527.270 (RSMo.1969, V.A.M.S.) rather than use the common law method to change her name. What has previously been said in reference to petitioner's common law right to change names, therefore, simply confirms petitioner's right to utilize the statutory procedure for changing names. Section 527.270, supra, and Rule 95.01, V.A. M.R. which is its counterpart do not abrogate and are merely supplemental to the common law method of name change. Under the common law, the change of name is accomplished by usage or habit, and under the statutory method, the change is accomplished by court order and public record. The primary difference between the two methods is, therefore, the speed and certainty of the change of name under the statutory procedure. 57 Am.Jur.2d, Name, § 11 (1971); 65 C.J.S. Names § 11(2) (1966). While no Missouri case has yet considered the relationship between the common law and statutory method of name change, the court's view that the common law and statutory methods of changing name coexist is consistent with the language of Section 1.010, supra, since Section 527.270 (RSMo 1969, V.A.M.S.) does not expressly abrogate the common law or invalidate the common law by inconsistency.*

End quote.

My point is this, even if I was a missouri citizen, or even if I was a united states citizen - it is not against the law to change your name.

Now, let's go back a little bit to what I told you about the persecutor's understanding of names. He said that I had somehow lost the quote unquote "right" to common law name change. Alright, let's see if this has any value at all. Can a man lose his right to name himself whatever he wants to?

In the Matter of Natale - the case which the missouri supreme court said quote "controls disposition of the issue" - refers for further discussion a case called State versus Euge. Here is what happened in this issue. Reading directly from State v Euge:

*[...Defendant, Harvey F. Euge, was convicted of obtaining money with intent to cheat and defraud by means of a bogus check under § 561.450 RSMo 1959, V.A. M.S., by a jury in the Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis, and his punishment was assessed at imprisonment in the custody of the State Department of Corrections for a term of two years. Following rendition of judgment and imposition of sentence in accordance with the verdict, an appeal was perfected to this Court.*

*The defendant has filed no brief in this Court. The case is before us on the transcript of the record and the brief of the respondent. Therefore, we consider such of the assignments of the motion for a new trial as are sufficient to comply with the requirements of Rule 27.20(a), [V.A. M.R. State v. Fraley, Mo.Sup., 369 S.W. 2d 195.](#)*

*Defendant assigns as error the overruling of his motions for directed verdict wherein he alleged that under the evidence he is not guilty of the offense charged against him because the check in issue was merely a check returned for insufficient funds. This assignment of error is sufficient to dispose of this case on appeal.*

*Section 561.450 RSMo 1959, V.A.M.S., under which defendant was prosecuted, provides that: "Every person who, with the intent to cheat and defraud, shall obtain or attempt to obtain, from any other person, or persons, any money, property or valuable thing whatever \* \* \* by means or by use, of any false or bogus check or by means of a check drawn, with intent to cheat and defraud, on a bank in which the drawer of the check knows he has no funds \* \* \* shall be deemed guilty of a felony \* \* \*."*

*The charging portion of the indictment reads as follows:*

*"THE GRAND JURORS OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI, within and for the body of the City of St. Louis, now here in Court, duly impaneled, sworn and charged, upon their oath present, That HARVEY F. EUGE between October 17th, and the 22nd day of October, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-three, at the City of St. Louis aforesaid, unlawfully, feloniously, designedly, fraudulently, with intent to cheat BANK OF ST. LOUIS, INCORPORATED, a Corporation, in the care and custody of HAROLD RATHMAN, by means and by use of a certain check purportedly drawn by one DAYTON MITCHELL HORN on an account in the MANCHESTER BANK of ST. LOUIS, a Corporation, and dated October 17th, 1963 and that HARVEY F. EUGE did present and tender the aforesaid check to HAROLD RATHMAN and the said HAROLD RATHMAN relying on the purported genuineness of the said check and being induced and deceived thereby did then and there give to the said HARVEY F. EUGE the sum of forty-five dollars, lawful money of the United States; the money and property of the said BANK OF ST. LOUIS, INCORPORATED, a corporation; and the said HARVEY F. EUGE at the time unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to cheat and defraud did obtain the aforesaid money and property from BANK of ST. LOUIS INCORPORATED, a corporation, and the defendant knew at the time he tendered the said check that the name of DAYTON MITCHELL HORN was in fact the name of a fictitious person and that the aforesaid check was bogus; contrary to Section 561.450, Missouri Revised Statutes, in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the State."*

*The State's evidence justifies the following statement: On September 19, 1963, defendant Harvey F. Euge went to the Manchester Bank of St. Louis, deposited \$40 cash*

*in a checking account under the name Dayton Mitchell Horn and ordered checks printed. Mrs. Daisy Hayes, an employee of the Manchester Bank, identified defendant at the trial as the man who opened the Horn account. Defendant had an account at the Bank of St. Louis from December 31, 1959, until January 28, 1963, when it was closed by the bank. This account was in the name of Harvey F. Euge. On October 17 or 18, 1963 (there is a conflict in the evidence as to the correct date), defendant went to a teller's window at the Bank of St. Louis and re-opened his account in the name Harvey F. Euge. He deposited a check in the amount of \$45 on the Manchester Bank of St. Louis, drawn to cash, signed by Dayton Mitchell Horn, and endorsed on the back by Harvey Euge. He received a deposit slip in return showing a \$45 deposit in the Harvey F. Euge account. Immediately thereafter he wrote a check in the amount of \$45 on the Harvey F. Euge account in the Bank of St. Louis, presented it to the teller at the Bank of St. Louis, and was given \$45 cash. The Bank of St. Louis processed the Horn check and it was returned by the Manchester Bank, marked "insufficient funds."*

Alright. I hope you were able to follow what this guy did. He had gotten mad that a couple years prior, the Bank of St. Louis closed his account that had the name Harvey S. Euge. So, he went back to the bank and opened an account with the name Dayton Mitchell Horn. He deposited \$40 to open the account. He then wrote a check to Harvey S. Euge for the amount of \$45 from the Horn account. He then tried to cash the \$45 check. The check was returned as insufficient funds. He was then charged with writing a bogus check because - quote - *"the said HARVEY F. EUGE at the time unlawfully, feloniously, and with intent to cheat and defraud did obtain the aforesaid money and property from BANK of ST. LOUIS INCORPORATED, a corporation, and the defendant knew at the time he tendered the said check that the name of DAYTON MITCHELL HORN was in fact the name of a fictitious person and that the aforesaid check was bogus;"*

When the missouri supreme court made their ruling - what did they say?

*[Here, the alleged bogus check was written by defendant Euge under the assumed name of Horn on the Horn account in the Manchester Bank and there was money, though insufficient, in said account. The check was drawn by a fictitious person. Horn was fictitious. Was the check drawn by a fictitious person under the rule set forth in State v. Todd, supra, and therefore violative of § 561.450 RSMo 1959, V.A.M.S.? We think not. End quote.*

I want to stop here for a second. Note very clearly, that this court said that the name Dayton Mitchell Horn was fictitious. They said that was a fictitious name. They are ultimately concluding that Euge used the name Horn for the sole purpose of trying to

steal money from the bank of St. Louis. So Euge created the name Horn - for the sole purpose of carrying out a fraud. This is very clear. Should be very simple. Let's go on.

*[Section 417.200 RSMo 1959, V.A. M.S., provides that it shall be unlawful to transact business under a fictitious name without first registering said name with the Secretary of State, and § 417.230 RSMo 1959, V.A.M.S., makes failure to register a misdemeanor. However, a person may assume a different name from his true one and may make contracts under his fictitious name. Sims v. Missouri State Life Ins. Co., 223 Mo.App. 1150, 23 S.W.2d 1075, 1078; 65 C.J.S. Names § 9, pp. 9-11. In his dealings with the Manchester Bank, defendant assumed the name Horn. He entered into a contract with the bank that, in return for his cash deposit, the bank would, when demanded, pay funds from the Horn account in such sums and to such persons as the depositor should direct. 7 Am.Jur., Banks, § 503, p. 358. This contract with the bank was not unlawful, nor did it contemplate the performance of an unlawful act. Defendant deposited cash in the Horn account. If he contemplated drawing money out of the account by signing the Horn name, he contemplated obtaining money which was his property.]*

Now, here comes their conclusion.

*[In the case before us, defendant opened an account under the name Dayton Mitchell Horn by depositing \$40 cash in the Manchester Bank. He subsequently drew a check in the amount of \$45 on said account and signed it with the name Dayton Mitchell Horn.]*

Now listen carefully, please to what they say next.

***[Defendant had authority to sign the name Dayton Mitchell Horn to the check. There was an account at the bank the day the check was written. Defendant could not have known when he signed the check that there were no funds in the Horn account because the evidence shows there were funds in the account. The check was returned marked "insufficient funds." Under this evidence, we do not consider the check a bogus check under § 561.450 RSMo 1959, V.A.M.S. The determining factor is that there were funds, though insufficient, in the Dayton Mitchell Horn account when the check was written. It is possible that defendant could have been charged under § 561.460 RSMo 1959, V.A.M.S., for drawing an insufficient funds check. However, he was not charged thereunder and we do not rule the question here.]***

Not only is it impossible for a man to forge his own name - but in regards to their citizens - the missouri supreme court makes it clear as can be - even in a clear case of fraud - the crime is not in the name that man calls himself - if there is a crime - it is in trying to steal something from someone else. The crime is not the name - it's whether or not you stole from someone else.

In the case of Harvey S. Euge, they said:

*[If he contemplated drawing money out of the account by signing the Horn name, he contemplated obtaining money which was his property.]*

Understand this clearly, the persecutor's in the state of Missouri are saying that because my name - Charlie Steward - was on the bill of sale FOR MY CAR - there has never been a question that it was my car - but because my name was on the bill of sale FOR MY CAR - that is felony forgery. And I should spend 7 years in prison on that charge alone - because my name - Charlie Steward - was on the bill of sale for my car.

I have actually had people tell me that this so crazy that they didn't believe me. But I'm telling you - this is exactly what is going on. And, I agree - it is crazy. It's madness. It's insane.

Deuteronomy 28:1-2 says this:

And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of Yahweh thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day, that Yahweh thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth:

And all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of Yahweh thy God.

But what if the people say no to Yahweh's offer?

Verses 27-28

Yahweh shall smite thee with madness, and blindness, and astonishment of heart:

And thou shalt grope at noonday, as the blind gropeth in darkness, and thou shalt not prosper in thy ways: and thou shalt be only oppressed and spoiled evermore, and no man shall save thee.

How can we not see that the very same principles found from Deuteronomy 28 have come upon this land today? It's our laws, and our CONstitution, and our treaties - they are the supreme law of the land.

Moreover all these curses shall come upon thee, and shall pursue thee, and overtake thee, till thou be destroyed; because thou hearkenedst not unto the voice of Yahweh thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which he commanded thee:

And they shall be upon thee for a sign and for a wonder, and upon thy seed for ever.

Because thou servedst not Yahweh thy God with joyfulness, and with gladness of heart, for the abundance of all things;

In that courtroom this past week, I'll assure you that the only Bible in that building was the one that I brought with me and laid it on the table opened to Psalm 37.

There is nothing whatsoever that resembles any type of relationship with the God of the Bible found in the courtrooms that I am being brought before. Before a hearing started one day I invited all in the courtroom to join me in prayer in seeking the Will of God for all our lives and in the matter at hand and when I said the final amen, I was rebuked by the judge and it was made clear that that would not happen again in his courtroom.

America has become mad and blind and cursed because it refuses to obey the Laws of God and has chosen the gods of the Amorites. Man has it all figured out and man's laws have been determined to be better than God's.

Before the ink was dry on my message last week and before the file was even uploaded to the radio station - I had talked about blood flowing in the streets of America because we are stiffnecked and hardhearted and refuse to repent and acknowledge the terrible crimes we have committed against a Loving God, His Son and His Kingdom - and once again people have been shot dead in more shootings. For goodness sake, a woman can't even go to Walmart anymore without being armed for protection.

I don't care if these types of shootings are false flags or whether they are real - it's beyond reason why Americans - forget about Americans - people who call themselves followers of Christ - continue to acknowledge that our sins against our God have brought terrible things upon us. The Scriptures are as clear as anything can possibly be:

And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of Yahweh thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day, that Yahweh thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth:

And all these blessings shall come on thee, and overtake thee, if thou shalt hearken unto the voice of Yahweh thy God.

Over and over and over throughout the Word of God - He makes the same plea, the same promise, the same offer to His people - from generation to generation - a father may reject Him - but He makes an offer to the son. Yet we continue to state by our words and by our deeds that our laws, our statues, our treaties, our CONstitutions - are the supreme law of the land.

It should be clear by now - that voting isn't making a difference. Politicians, right, left, atheist or professing Christian - are not making a difference. As a nation, it should be clear that the vast majority will not even consider "Coming out from among them and be ye separate and I will be your God and you will be my people." We are afraid. We are

afraid of losing our lives, our property, our families. We fear man more than we fear God.

How have we gotten to this point?

The lie of futurism - taught by the deception of the "church and the churchmen" is why we are where we are today.

I have laid such a rock solid foundation in these messages that the Gospel is, "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand" and that meant for the first century - that if a man is not seeing that - we can only continue to drive it home - until he does. The first century was the FIRST century because it was the beginning of the New World.

The Messiah had come to put an end to the Old Covenant World. The Messiah had come to make all things new. The Messiah had come and was born for this reason --- He did not say that His only purpose was to be born and then to die. It is written in John 18:33

Then Pilate entered into the judgment hall again, and called Jesus, and said unto him, Art thou the King of the Jews?

[34] Jesus answered him, Sayest thou this thing of thyself, or did others tell it thee of me?

[35] Pilate answered, Am I a Jew? Thine own nation and the chief priests have delivered thee unto me: what hast thou done?

[36] Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.

[37] Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.

Friends, today, if you do not understand that the reason Jesus was born was to be King - then you need to begin immediately examining everything you think you know about what it means to be born again. You've more than likely been taught all your life that He is a coming King - that He's not King now - but will someday return to this earth to be King - I'm telling you - you need to search the Scriptures - for in what you think you have been taught - you think you have eternal life - but outside of the Kingship of Christ - I'm telling you - there is no salvation.

"But I believe in the death, burial and resurrection of Christ." So do the devils. And they even trembled at that knowledge. One could argue that the death, burial and resurrection of Christ was part of the Gospel - but you would struggle to find more Scriptural evidence to support that the teaching of the death burial and resurrection of

Christ is more than the preaching and teaching that the Gospel is the Gospel of the Kingdom. That Jesus, Yeshua IS King of kings and Lord of lords - and it is the responsibility of every living breathing creature to bow their knees - right now - before King Jesus - and proclaim that His Laws, His Statutes, His Judgements, His Ordinances, His Perfect Will - is the Supreme Law of not just this land - but over ALL His creation.

We are in the middle of teaching "Church or Kingdom?" It cannot be argued against that the overwhelming majority of people alive today - understand the word "church" to mean a building where people go to worship - and most people say to worship God or to worship Jesus." However, the church of satan would not agree. Their quote unquote "church" is a building for the purpose of going to worship - as they say satan.

The Baptist quote unquote "church" is incorporated by the state. The Assembly of God quote unquote "church" is incorporated by the state. The quote unquote "church of Christ, the Nazarenes, the Mennonites - all incorporated by the state. The church of satan - incorporated by the state in exactly the same way that all of them are. Quote unquote "church" is a building incorporated by the state and must operate and carry on its business according to the laws of its creator - the state.

This is not what Jesus Christ came to build.

He came to build His Kingdom.

In last week's message, I did something I don't think I've ever done in all my years of ministry - and this is preach a message without ever directing someone to a passage of Scripture. I ran out of time and Lord willing, that will not happen again.

Turn with me please to Acts 19. Here we will find the best source of understanding for the difference between quote unquote "church" and Kingdom that I believe there is available for us today - at least that's my opinion for whatever that's worth. We need to begin in verse 1 - very important that you are following along in your Bibles.

And it came to pass, that, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus: and finding certain disciples,  
And it came to pass, that, while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus: and finding certain disciples,  
[2] He said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.  
[3] And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism.

Very briefly here I would refer you to the words of John the Baptist in Matthew 3:11, John said:

I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire:

Back to verse 4 of Acts 19.

[4] Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.

[5] When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.

[6] And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied.

[7] And all the men were about twelve.

Let's slow it way down here now for verse 8. Watch and listen closely.

[8] And he went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God.

Let's look again.

[8] And he went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, **disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God.**

Think about this please. Were the events taking place in the Old Covenant world? Yes. This was all going on in the Old Covenant World. The temple had not yet been destroyed. Paul here was not in THE temple in Jerusalem, but he was in a synagogue - a building set aside for the purpose of worship.

Paul was there for 3 whole months teaching - look - disputing and persuading things concerning the Kingdom of God. For 3 months Paul was teaching that Christ had come, and that He was King and the Kingdom of God was soon to be implemented. "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." He was persuading concerning the Kingdom - not a "church." The Greek word here for kingdom is basilia, 932 in Strong's meaning royalty, rule, a realm, kingdom, and reign. Wow is that cool. Hopefully that didn't sound sacrilege - but that's just plain awesome. 932 says it comes from 935 through the notion of a foundation of power, a sovereign, a king. Yes! That's Who This Jesus we preach is. And He's the same now as He was in the first century.

The message that Paul was preaching was the same message that John the Baptist was preaching. Jesus, Yeshua, was the Christ. He was the Anointed One. He is the King. He's the Only King, the Only Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords. Neither is there salvation in any other name - for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved. There is no other authority - that's what "in the name of" means.

Today, we've messed it up really badly. We're so upside down and backwards. Most people in and around the world refer to men's governments as the quote "powers that be." When there is NO POWER but of God. Jesus is King - the Only King. God's Laws are valid, relevant, and are the only ones allowed in the New Covenant World today - and that's what Jesus taught, that's what the Apostles taught, and that's what Paul was preaching in Acts 19. And the response we are getting ready to read in verse 9 from those people back then - is the same response you get today - because those people did not accept Him as King - and people today do not accept Him as King.

Verse 9:

[9] But when divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude,

Notice - they spake evil of that way. Yes. The Kingdom of God and the Kingship of Christ is a way, it's a way of life, it's the way of the New Covenant World in which was established in the first century and it is supposed to be established from generation to generation and it is established in the lives of those who will allow His reign - from generation to generation.

But when divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude, he departed from them, and separated the disciples, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus.

[10] And this continued by the space of two years; so that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks.

[11] And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul:

[12] So that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them.

[13] Then certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth.

[14] And there were seven sons of one Sceva, a Jew, and chief of the priests,

which did so.

[15] And the evil spirit answered and said, Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?

[16] And the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, and overcame them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded.

There is an entire message here that I will preach someday called, "The Seven Silly Sons of Sceva." The seven silly sons of Sceva were preaching "church" not Kingdom - and their message was powerless and they were devoured. Verse 17.

[17] And this was known to all the Jews and Greeks also dwelling at Ephesus; and fear fell on them all, and the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified.

[18] And many that believed came, and confessed, and shewed their deeds.

[19] Many of them also which used curious arts brought their books together, and burned them before all men: and they counted the price of them, and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver.

[20] So mightily grew the word of God and prevailed.

[21] After these things were ended, Paul purposed in the spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, After I have been there, I must also see Rome.

[22] So he sent into Macedonia two of them that ministered unto him, Timotheus and Erastus; but he himself stayed in Asia for a season.

[23] And the same time there arose no small stir about that way.

[24] For a certain man named Demetrius, a silversmith, which made silver shrines for Diana, brought no small gain unto the craftsmen;

[25] Whom he called together with the workmen of like occupation, and said, Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth.

[26] Moreover ye see and hear, that not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods, which are made with hands:

[27] So that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at nought; but also that the temple of the great goddess Diana should be despised, and her magnificence should be destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshippeth.

[28] And when they heard these sayings, they were full of wrath, and cried out, saying, Great is Diana of the Ephesians.

[29] And the whole city was filled with confusion: and having caught Gaius and Aristarchus, men of Macedonia, Paul's companions in travel, they rushed with one accord into the theatre.

[30] And when Paul would have entered in unto the people, the disciples suffered him not.

[31] And certain of the chief of Asia, which were his friends, sent unto him, desiring him that he would not adventure himself into the theatre.

[32] Some therefore cried one thing, and some another: for the assembly was confused; and the more part knew not wherefore they were come together.

[33] And they drew Alexander out of the multitude, the Jews putting him forward. And Alexander beckoned with the hand, and would have made his defence unto the people.

[34] But when they knew that he was a Jew, all with one voice about the space of two hours cried out, Great is Diana of the Ephesians.

[35] And when the townclerk had appeased the people, he said, Ye men of Ephesus, what man is there that knoweth not how that the city of the Ephesians is a worshipper of the great goddess Diana, and of the image which fell down from Jupiter?

Alright. Notice here how political this has gotten. The townclerk is now involved.

[36] Seeing then that these things cannot be spoken against, ye ought to be quiet, and to do nothing rashly.

[37] For ye have brought hither these men, which are neither robbers of churches, nor yet blasphemers of your goddess.

[38] Wherefore if Demetrius, and the craftsmen which are with him, have a matter against any man, the law is open, and there are deputies: let them implead one another.

Once again, clearly note the political language of the discussion. "A matter against any man, the law is open, there deputies...etc."

[39] But if ye inquire any thing concerning other matters, it shall be determined in a lawful assembly.

This is all political language. This is not quote unquote "church." This is government. This is secular government being talked about here. And what Greek word do you think is used for "it shall be determined in a lawful assembly?" The Greek word for assembly here is ecclesia. This whole dispute here is political. It's the Kingdom of God versus the kingdom of men. It's all ecclesia - God's ecclesia versus man's ecclesia. Church is not here. "Churches" is - and it is referencing the temples of Diana. The KJV translators got

it right here - "churches" are buildings and they are the false temples of Diana. Ecclesia - Christ's ecclesia - is the Kingdom of God - it is not the temples of Diana. Verse 40:

[40] For we are in danger to be called in question for this day's uproar, there being no cause whereby we may give an account of this concourse.

[41] And when he had thus spoken, he dismissed the assembly.

When who had spoken? The townsclerk. He dismissed the assembly. What assembly? The secular ecclesia. My friends, if we do not see the true meaning of ecclesia described in Acts 19 - I don't know what else we can do.

The whole conflict described in Acts 19 was the Kingdom of God versus the secular ecclesia of Ephesus. Paul was preaching the Kingdom of God. The Ephesians were upset because Paul was teaching they were to abandon their secular ecclesia and come into the Kingdom of God - the ecclesia of King Jesus.

I challenge you to go back and read this chapter over and over until you see the Kingdom of God - the quote unquote "churches" - which were buildings set aside for the worship of the pagan goddess Diana - and then the secular ecclesia.

Once again, time has just flown by. Lord willing, we'll continue next week. I want to get back to making a few comments regarding JN Darby and contrast his week with C.I. Scofield's.