

A Biblical Response to Dr. Todd Phillips Part 2

Chapter 1: Introduction

Amen. Thank you, Sasha, for that wonderful prayer. Welcome, everybody. Welcome, especially if you're new. I've had several new people reach out to me this week asking how to join. And so, hopefully you make it or are making it in the process of, but we're grateful that you're here as we do part two of our biblical response to Dr. Todd Phillips. On a side note, I started a new series yesterday from my short form videos defending Paul against those who think he's a heretic. And I posted one, I don't know, 8 minute video yesterday just talking about the series and what's upcoming in the series. Holy cow, the number of people that have gotten on and uh spewed their anti- Paul rhetoric and uh it's just been crazy. I've thanked a couple of them for providing fodder for my videos that will be upcoming. So, that's going to be a lot of fun in the dailies, you know, breaking down these fallacies about Paul that just aren't true. So, be looking forward to that in the dailies. But today we're talking part two, a biblical response to Dr. Todd Phillips. Let me just encourage you, if you have not seen part one yet, then I would encourage you to please start there before you watch this video if yo

u're on YouTube because you need to have a a better understanding of why we're even doing this. But let's jump into this and see what we can see. Before we begin part two, I want to briefly address what happened with part one.

Chapter 2: Response to Part 1

That response, our response was delivered directly to Dr. Todd Phillips through both YouTube and Facebook, making every reasonable effort to ensure that he had an opportunity to see it. Yet, those efforts were either deleted, removed, or simply ignored. I posted a link on this video of his 10 passages I couldn't defend inviting him to watch it and engage with me and that post was deleted and so I reached out to him on Facebook Messenger and he has not responded to that one either. So what does that say? At the very least it raises an important question. It's one thing to publicly present difficult biblical questions and declare that Christians have no adequate answers, which is basically what his video does. It's quite another to seriously engage those answers when they are offered and he is not. So, nevertheless, whether Dr. Phillips chooses to respond is ultimately beside the point. These questions deserve answers, not only because he asked them, but because countless sincere people have wrestled with the same passages. There are people who read these accounts and genuinely wonder how they can reconcile them with the justice, goodness, and character of the God revealed throughout

scripture. So, we continue. In part two, we will address the remaining five questions. Scratch that. We will address the remaining four questions in the same methodical way, allowing scripture itself to provide the context and answers these difficult questions demand. Why four? Well, I got to question nine, uh, his questions about slavery, and I realized, oh my goodness, I'll never be able to fit a proper response to the topic of biblical slavery into this lesson. So, I decided that I would do it for its own lesson. So maybe next week we'll have a a response to that question on slavery because there is a lot of ins and outs on this topic as you could probably imagine and I wanted to make sure that we didn't not give it its full uh answer by shortening it in a lesson like the one that we're doing today. Hopefully that makes sense.

Chapter 3: Lot and his daughters

So on to Todd's defenseless questions. We're going to start today with Lot and his daughters. Assuming that you will know some of this stuff already based on your own study. I didn't take the time to list the verses in question in this section, but I do in others. So, I'm relying on your knowledge of some of this stuff already from your own personal Bible study. So when it comes to Lot and his daughters, Todd opens by explaining the events of Genesis 19 regarding Lot and his daughter daughters and then says, and this is him quoting and then the narrative never pauses

where God comes in and condemns Lot for offering his daughters. It never happens and he's still the one that's delivered from the city. And later in Peter, in second Peter, he's called righteous. Lot is called righteous. So, you know, if you know the story, there were people from Sodom and Gomorrah banging down his door, wanting to engage in sexual conduct with the angels and Lot offers his daughters instead. And so, that's why Todd is saying that God never comes in and condemns Lot for that. He says it never happens. and he's still the one that's delivered. So, for the record, I pondered a while on how to say the full

owing because I didn't want to insult Dr. Phillips or any of his followers. I wanted to say that this was an uneducated position and that can sometimes sound harsh, but I realized that the best term is not uneducated. The problem is hermeneutical. And that's always a fun word to say fast. Five times. What is hermeneutics? Hermeneutics is the process of correctly interpreting a text by asking what the author intended to communicate, what the words meant or mean in their original setting, how the passage fits its literary and historical context, and how it relates to the rest of scripture. Good hermeneutics asks what the text says, what it meant in its original context, and whether we are reading into the passage, something that the author never intended. So, what is the flawed hermeneutic that Phillips is using here? What's a better way to say that? Because sometimes these big words can confuse. What what's the flawed interpretational method that Phillips is using here? Well, it's this. It's the assumption that inspired narration equals divine approval. Why is that the the hermenetic? Well, because he says in his statement above, the narrative never pauses to condemn Lot for offerin

g his daughters. It never happens. So the flawed hermeneutic or the flawed interpretational tool in his reasoning is the fact that inspired narration equals divine approval. The narration here is inspired. How do we know it's inspired? Well, it's Moses, right? So, it's inspired narration. But that inspired narration doesn't equal divine approval. And I'm going to explain that a little bit more here in a bit. Scripture does not interrupt every sinful act with an immediate editorial statement declaring that this was sinful. This is true both for Lot's actions and the actions of his daughters later in the narrative, but we see this many times in scripture. Abraham deceiving Abimelech, Jacob deceiving Isaac, Sarah giving Hagar to Abraham, Laban giving Leah to Jacob through deception, and the brothers selling Joseph. We read those stories and we can see within them the evil. And yet in these situations, the text doesn't immediately declare that. And that's the problem that Dr. Phillips is having in this story with Lot and his daughters. The narrative never pauses where God comes in and condemns Lot for offering his daughters. The Bible's accuracy in recording human evil is not approval

of that evil. That's a very important statement. The Bible's accuracy in recording human evil is not in any way approval of that evil. Lot's offer was never commanded. It was never praised or accepted by the father. In fact, it was the angels who prevented the mob from fulfilling Lot's intentions. So, is that a narrative where the scripture intervenes? Perhaps, depending on how you read it. But we just have to understand that in our Bible study, whether it's Todd Phillips or somebody else, we're going to see a lot of things happen as these stories are explained. These hundreds and thousands of years of human life and their interactions with the most high are going to be written down and not always are we going to see the moment where God steps in and says, "Oh, by the way, what just happened here was sin." So, we have to understand that. So, the question then is why does Yahovah save Lot and why does Peter call Lot righteous? And that's a honest question. And that's that's why we're here. We're here to answer honest questions because in that story, we see that Lot was saved even though he did this despicable thing of trying to offer his daughters up as ransom. Why does Yah save Lot

? And why does Peter call Lot righteous? Well, Lot was most certainly not rescued because every action he performed was righteous, right? So what then? Why does the father save Lot? Well, Genesis 19 says, "It came to pass then Yahovah destroyed the cities of the plain that Yahovah remembered Abraham and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow when he overthrew the cities in which Lot had dwelt." That's the answer to the first question. Why does Yahovah save Lot? It's because the father remembers Abraham. Really simple, really straightforward. No other commentary is necessary. Why does Peter call Lot righteous? Second Peter 2. He delivered righteous Lot and he

offers the reason why. Who was oppressed by the filthy conduct of the wicked? Now, did Lot do something wicked? Yes. But he was oppressed by the filthy conduct of the wicked there in that city. for that righteous man dwelling among them tormented his righteous soul from day to day by seeing and hearing their lawless deeds. So here's the question. Did Lot do something really really stupid? There's no question he did. But does that act of stupidity condemn him when he is otherwise righteous? No. Consider all of our other hero

es in the Bible. Moses was a murderer. really dumb stupid thing. David was a murderer, an adulterer. Really dumb stupid things. But these acts of sin, these acts of stupidity do not mark them forever. Do not condemn them forever. And we say, "Praise God for that." We should all praise Yahovah for the fact that he still works through flawed men and women. Because if we apply Dr. Phillip's poor hermeneutic to everyone, then none of us would escape condemnation and none of us would be declared righteous if we used his reasoning for everybody else. Righteous does not mean sinlessly perfect. I would like to consider myself somewhat righteous, mainly because of my faith in Yeshua. Does that mean I'm perfect? you at all like to consider yourselves to be righteous in one degree or the other? Does that mean you're sinlessly perfect? No. Does that mean you don't do stupid things? No. Psalm 103. Yahovah is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, abounding in mercy. He will not always strive with us, nor will he keep his anger forever. He has not dealt with us according to our sins. Amen. nor punished us according to our iniquities and our stupidities. As far as the east is from the west, so far

as he removed our transgressions from us. Is that also true for Lot in this case? Yeah, absolutely. Amen. So, did Lot do something really dumb? Yeah, he did. Does the scripture come right out and condemn him immediately? No, it doesn't. But we all know if we know our Bibles that what he did was really dumb. Does that condemn him forever? No, it doesn't. Does it stain his otherwise, in Peter's words, righteous soul? No, it doesn't. And it shouldn't. And we're thankful to the father that it doesn't.

Chapter 4: David, Bathsheba, and guilt

So, we move on to the next defenseless question. The punishment of innocence surrounding David's sin. Philip's objection is that others, including people who appear innocent of David's wrongdoing, suffered because of David's actions. The question then is whether Yahovah's judgment can still be called just when the consequences of one man's sin extend beyond the sinner himself. And that sounds familiar, right? We just talked about this, didn't we? We just talked about the transfer of guilt from one generation to the next. Scripture expressly rejects this idea of transferred guilt. And we've read this scripture many times recently. Fathers shall not be put to death for their children, nor shall the children be put to death for their fathers. A person shall be put to death for his own sin. This is our baseline. What does that mean? When we're trying to understand certain difficult verses in scripture, certain difficult stories in scripture, or certain difficult doctrines in scripture, we have to have baselines. A baseline or as I call them, anchors keeps you rooted in absolute truth. So you don't wander off in vague truths in trying to figure something out. Okay, I'll give you an exam

ple unassociated with Dr. Phillips. One of the anchors in my life and I've encouraged you to have them in your life is Malachi 3 that my God Yahovah does not change. That's an anchor. That's my baseline when trying to figure out difficult things in my New Testament. If anything that I assumed to be true in my New Testament research forces me to violate Malachi 3, then I am misunderstanding my Bible. If my doctrine forces Yahovah to change, then my doctrine is incorrect. Similarly here in this discussion our baseline is Deuteronomy 24 that children are not put to death for the death or the sin of their father. That has to be our baseline when we're especially trying to figure out this accusation of Dr. Phillips. He flat out says and these are quotes from him directly from his video. David sins and his child dies. There it is. We really don't have to read anything else he says because he says right here, David sins and his child dies. If Deuteronomy 24:16 is our baseline, is our anchor, then his initial six words there challenges Deuteronomy 24:16, right? There has to be more. There has to be something we're not understanding. Let's continue this quote. Other people suffer because of

what David did. God punishes innocent people for someone else's sin. King David commits adultery with Bathsheba. The text actually says that what David did in private, God will repay him publicly. That his wives will be taken from him and given to someone close to him. And later, that's exactly what happens when Absalom takes David's concubines, his wives, and sleeps with them on a rooftop in public. And then there's David's child. It says God strikes the child down that came from the adulterous act and the child becomes sick and then the child dies. And again, it says God is doing this. The consequences of David's actions fall on other people who had nothing to do with it. women who had no role in what he did and a child who obviously as a baby had no part in it at all. I couldn't reconcile what happens to David's wives and the death of his child with any idea of justice whatsoever. And there it is in blue. I, Dr. Phillips couldn't reconcile what happens to David's wives in the death of this child with any idea of justice whatsoever. David, Tim, in your own carefully chosen words, what is the problem with the statement in blue? Well, maybe part of the fact that he can't reconcile

doesn't necessarily mean that it is inconsistent with who God is. We talked about it before part one where his thoughts are not our thoughts, right? And so we might have to leave some room for that. The other element probably related to the hermeneutics uh is is the element of potentially some more context with respect to these things uh as well as maybe related to what you said earlier sinful act of someone else and in this case maybe Absalom uh obviously not the baby is not something that God automatically condones because of the fact that it's represented in the Bible. Okay, Tim, I was going to say that just because he couldn't understand God's ways doesn't mean that God's ways were off. And then also his idea of God's justice is not necessarily God's ideas. So says God's ways are beyond searching out. Who can understand them? So So that would be my response to that. Yeah. I mean, you're you're both dead on. Basically what I'm seeing here as I'm reading Todd's words, especially the words in blue, is he is comparing his definition, his idea of justice against the fathers. And really by the nature of his entire presentation and the fact that he has basically built up a new o

nline persona surrounding this whole deconstruction thing that he's doing. He is basically elevating his definition of justice above the fathers. I couldn't reconcile. What does that mean? I couldn't make my definition of justice equal his. That's what reconciliation is. I couldn't reconcile. So, at the very least, he's got his definition of justice and morality, trying to butt up against the father's definition as if he would know it. As Tim just said, it's beyond knowing. But because he can't reconcile, he has kicked up his definition of morality and justice just a little bit higher by condemning Yahovah's actions. Do you see the danger here? It's not a problem to ask questions. We all have questions. We all should have questions. He gave us a brain to rationalize everything. So the fact that we have questions, not a problem. Not at all. The problem isn't that we have questions. The problem isn't that we having a hard time answering those questions. The problem isn't that we wrestle with those questions. That's what Israel is. He who wrestles with God. No, we need to wrestle. problem is when you begin condemning the most high when your idea of justice doesn't somehow match up wit

h his idea of justice. Phillips is not primarily arguing that David escaped punishment. His central argument is that innocent people suffered as a part of the judgment against David and he as he said cannot reconcile that. And all of this goes back to three weeks ago, doesn't it? Where we had an entire discussion on the difference between generational curses and generational guilt. We know the story of David, Bathsheba, and Uriah. Hopefully, we all know that without going too deeply into it. So, let's unpack this a little bit. In 2 Samuel 11, the scripture does, the narrative does stop and condemn David's actions with Bathsheba as sin. But the thing that David had done was evil in the sight of Yahovah. That sentence alone controls everything that follows in the story. David may have successfully hidden his actions from the public, but he's not hidden them from Yahovah. Nathan then confronts David. We all know this story where Nathan's casually telling David this story, getting David all riled up. And then turns to him and says, "You're that man. You're the man that I'm describing." Right? And as a result, Nathan then announces several consequences. Who is Nathan, by the way? Was he

just David's best friend? No, he was a prophet. 2 Samuel 12. Now therefore, the sword shall never depart from your house as a result of David's sin because you have despised me and have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your wife. And all of what is said here by Nathan becomes painfully literal in David's life. Amnon rapes Tamar in 2 Samuel 13. Absalom murders Amnon in 2 Samuel 13. Absalom rebels against David in 2 Samuel 15. Absalom is eventually killed in 2 Samuel 18. Later, Adonijah attempts to seize David's throne and is eventually executed in First Kings 2. So all these things Nathan prophesied that the sword would never depart from his house is becoming true. So when Yahovah says, "The sword shall never depart from your house," the remainder of David's life demonstrates exactly what that meant. Now, let me share a personal story. And uh when I do, I'm sure many of you, if not all of you, will begin to relate. When I was 10, 11, can't quite remember exactly how old I was, somewhere around there, my dad cheated on my mother. and as a result threw our family into disarray. The adultery eventually led to their divorce, separation, divorce. And I can tell you without a s

hadow of a doubt, as can Christine, who was on the call today, that ever since that moment, the sword has never departed from his house. In the course of my life and my sister's life, that decision has snowballed into so many areas of our life, determining the direction of our life as children from that moment. My two older sisters were teenagers when this happened. So they basically became bloating souls. No one was really taking care of them. They became completely independent, spiraled into all kinds of sinful things, drugs and all kinds of stuff. As did I. As did my younger sister Christine. It permanently put a destructive pattern in place as it pertains to our relationship with mom and dad. So, I can tell you from my own personal life that that decision that my dad made so many years ago, we're still paying for today and I'm 60 years old. That sword never left his house. And this is what we have to understand about the nature of sin, especially as it pertains to David. Lamentations 5, our fathers sinned and are no more, but we bear their iniquities, and we do, and they did in scripture. The guilt doesn't pass from father to son, but the consequences created by the father's si

n can and does outlive the father and becomes burdens for the children that they must carry. 2 Samuel 12, thus says Yahovah, behold, I will raise up adversity against you from your own house, and I will take your wives before your eyes and give them to your neighbor, and ye shall lie with your wives in the sight of his of the son. Everything that Nathan prophesied came to pass. Before I go on, let me just make this plain here. The father says here, I will raise up adversity. Okay, that's him taking responsibility. However, my deep conviction, my deep personal conviction about blessings and curses are as follows. We we can read in Deuteronomy 28 that basically says that if we follow him, obey him, love him, serve him, and do what we were designed to do as his children, that the Bible says our lives will be overflowing with blessings. Blessed that you'll be when you come in, and blessed that you'll be when you come out. I mean, it's just over and over. Read read Deuteronomy 28 when we're done and you'll see. It's just ridiculous how many ways the Bible says we're blessed. But then right after that, a new paragraph starts and it says, "Cursed will you be if you don't cursed, cursed, c

ursed, cursed, cursed." Now, what does that mean? I've explained this before. I'm going to do it again. Does that mean that the father is up there with pen and paper specifically identifying and marking down where you were disobedient or where you weren't disobedient? Oh, I saw what you did there. You're blessed. Oh. Oh, I can I see what you did there. Cursed. No. Remember his laws were spoken into existence. What else was spoken into existence? Everything else. Every physical law. that we are governed by, spoken into existence. Things like thermonuclear laws, things like natural laws, things like the law of gravity, whether you believe in it or not. These are natural processes. We call them natural that the father has spoken into existence just like he spoke into his law. So I believe that when a person violates his laws, it's not him up there saying, "Okay, here comes the pain." No, that mechanism is already built into creation. So when he says, "I will raise up adversity against you," can he do that apart from his laws? Of course, he's yh. No, I believe that built into our existence are these laws that work against us when we are not walking with him and vice versa. And I hope t

hat makes sense. As I said, I've explained this before many, many times, but I just think it's true. I don't think his spoken law is somehow different from everything else he spoke into existence. No, I think they're all the same. Nathan here is basically prophesying all these things that will happen as a result of David's sin. And they do. But we can't ignore the child because that's at the crux of Dr. Phillip's issue. The child born to David and Bathsheba present the most difficult part of the account because there the text explicitly says that the child will die and this is undeniably difficult and scripture does not soften it and neither should you when you're trying to explain it to somebody. Do not ever make excuses for what you don't understand in scripture. This is an undeniably difficult situation. Don't soften it. Don't make excuses for your God. 2 Samuel 12. However, because by this deed you have given great occasion to the enemies of Yahovah to blaspheme, the child also who was born to you shall surely die. Again, undeniably difficult. The Bible is saying that because of the deed that David did in giving great occasion to the enemies of Yahovah to blasphem. In other word

s, blaspheming his name that the child must die. And the child does seven days after it's born. Right? We know the story. But notice carefully what scripture says and what it doesn't say in this regard. It does not say that the child was guilty of David's adultery. It does not say that David's guilt was transferred to the child. It does not say that the child was being executed under Torah as though the child had committed David's crime. No, the death of the child is announced as a consequence of David's actions and of the dishonor that David's actions brought upon the name of Yahovah. Remember who David is. He is the king. There are laws for kings. Deuteronomy 17. He, the king, shall write for himself a copy of this law in a book, and it shall be with him, and he shall read it all the days of his life, that his heart may not be lifted above his brethren, that he may not turn aside from the commandments that are in it. David has done this. And so his error, his sin was not just the sin of any average everyday brother. With greater responsibility comes greater judgment. And it was the case with David. So what is undeniable in this story? Well, I already told you the text explicitly

attributes the child's illness and subsequent death to Yahovah. There is no question. I have two thoughts in this regard. One, Psalm 127 tells us that children are a heritage from Yahovah. The fruit of the womb is a reward, right? Deuteronomy 28:18 says, "Cursed shall be the fruit of your body and the produce of your land." Remember I just told you about Deuteronomy 28 and all the curses that come when we don't follow him? Well, one of them is the fruit of our bodies will be cursed. If children are a heritage from Yah and the fruit of our womb a reward, then what happens when that fruit is the result of adultery? Is that also a reward? No. We have to see things the way the father sees them. Remember last week, his ways are not our ways. And as Tim correctly noted a moment ago, we don't think like him. In trying to understand these difficult moments, we have to try. We have to do our very best to think like him. And second, we see a familiar pattern in the story of David and the loss of his child, don't we? Think about it for a moment. As much as I talk about typology, I don't necessarily think the story with David is typology. However, it's still familiar. What's familiar about it?

The guilty man lived. David lived while an innocent son dies as a consequence of the guilty man's sin. Typology maybe, maybe not. Not willing to say absolutely. But it's a familiar pattern in this story that we can't afford to not look at. So why does it surprise you, Todd? Innocent people can be impacted by another person's sin. The entire biblical narrative is filled with the consequences of sin, reaching far beyond the person who committed it, beginning with Adam himself. Do you also take issue with Yahovah because you were born into a world corrupted by Adam's transgression? A world in which you are mortal, corruptible, and subject to death and decay? Paul explicitly says, "Through one man's sin entered the world, and death through sin, and thus death spread to all men. Todd, you didn't eat from the tree, yet you live every day with the consequences of the man who did. Do you have a problem with that? That is not inherited guilt. Scripture holds each person accountable for his own sin. But the consequences of sin do not respect generational boundaries. Children suffer from the decisions of their fathers. Nations inherit the devastation created by previous generations. Families

can continue carrying burdens created long before they were born. So if you're going to condemn this principle as unjust when you encounter it in the Torah, then consistency demands that you confront the same principle from Genesis to Revelation. The problem is not that scripture fails to address your objection. The problem is that your objection ignores one of the most fundamental realities scripture establishes from its opening chapters. Sin never affects only the sinner. So the question is, are you as equally alarmed at the son of God innocently dying for your sin? If we're going to be honest, we're going to be intellectually honest. You were at one point a Christian before you were so-called deconstructed. Did you also have a problem with Yeshua dying for your sin? Having no sin in and of himself died for you? It's the same story. It's an innocent son dying as a consequence of somebody else's sin. You see guys, we have to use our I say it all the time jokingly, but we have to use our noggin here. We're looking into these things. And I asked the question, what better way to teach this this whole idea of sin having such overreaching power than to display it in real life scenes

in scripture. And really, at the end of the day, guys, that's what scripture is. Scripture is giving us real life application for what sin does. We hear all the time that death comes as a result of sin, but we never see it in our lives. Well, we do hear. We do in scripture, and that's its purpose.

Chapter 5: The Midianite captives

So, let's jump on to the Midianite girls. How we doing on time? Oh, we're doing pretty good. Okay. Todd's defenseless questions. the Midianite girls. Numbers 31:18-19. The text says, "But keep alive for yourselves all the young girls who have not known a man intimately. As for you, remain outside the camp seven days. Whoever has killed any person and whoever has touched any slain, purify yourselves and your captives on the third day and on the seventh day." What's happening here? Well, as Todd says, these young girls are taken after war with no agency. They have no consent, no ability to refuse what happens next. And the text, here we are again. The text never shows that God corrects Moses for what he commands. It simply says the girls are to be kept for the men. That's it. What's what's the implication here? The strong implication here is that the girls were given to the men as sexual spoils of war mostly because of our own hypersexualized culture that we live in. Can we read something like that and come to that conclusion? But I think that's what the implication is here in this context. So a few facts. Numbers 31 never says the girls were given to the soldiers for sexual use. Nev

er. Again, you have to be academic here in the way that you approach certain verses. And the fact is Numbers 31 never says the girls were given to the soldiers for sexual use. Fact number two, the phrase keep alive for yourselves means that they were spared and incorporated among Israel. It does not say take them sexually, rape them or make them concubines. We have inferred that when we read verses like this. And thirdly, the subsequent distribution also disproves the idea that all these girls were individually claimed by soldiers as sexual prizes. They weren't. The text tells us in Numbers 31:27, "Divide the plunder into two parts. Would the girls be considered plunder?" Yes. divide the plunder into two parts between those who took part in the war who went out to battle and all the congregation. If a captive woman later becomes wife, Deuteronomy 21 regulates that process. The scriptures say she's given time to mourn. Mourn what? Well, her people, her nation was just defeated in battle, so she's given time to mourn. She could not immediately be treated sexually as plunder and could never later be sold for profit. Deuteronomy 21. After that, after what? After her time for mourning,

you may go into her and be her husband, not rape her, not use her as a sexual slave. You may become her husband, and she shall be your wife. And it shall be if you have no delight in her that you shall set her free, but you certainly shall not sell her for money. Okay. So, the Torah has law for how to take care of these women who are kept as spoils of war. And the fact is there's great respect built into these laws for these women. No, they weren't supposed to be used for sexual use by individual soldiers. Not at all. We have to make

Chapter 6: Amalek and the infants

sure we pay attention to what the scripture actually says. What about Amalek and the Infants? Here is where we would have gotten into slavery, but as I said at the beginning, we have to reserve that for its own lesson. So, we're going to jump straight to Amalek and the infants. How we doing so far, David and Tim? I know I haven't pulled you in too much, but any any thoughts up to this point that you want to share? Makes a lot of sense. uh as usual providing the biblical context and referring back to uh other scriptures that uh you know provide a a better understanding of God's true ways I think is very helpful. Yeah. I was just going to say it makes me uh fear and respect God and his the provision in the law that he's provided for us as well. Yeah. Yeah. Amen. And so let's jump into uh the the question that Todd has of Amalek and the infants. You you I think you know the story. 1st Samuel 15. Samuel also said to Saul, Yahovah sent me to anoint you king over his people over Israel. Now therefore heed the voice of the words of Yahovah. Thus says Yahovah, I will punish Amalek for what he did to Israel. How he ambushed him on the way when he came up from Egypt. Now go attack Amalek and

utterly destroy all that they have, and do not spare them, but kill both man and woman, infant and nursing, child, ox and sheep, camel and donkey. Tim, when you read that for the first time, what's the first thing going through your brain? A little harsh. It's a little harsh, you know, just to kill everything. Yeah. I mean, who wouldn't get their attention got right at reading that verse that the father is instructing this new king to kill everything, man and woman, infant and nursing child, and all the animals. That sounds very extreme to our human understanding of justice. Here's Todd Phillips in his own words. Now the reason given in the story is crazy. It's something that happened about 400 years earlier. So back in Exodus, the Amalekites attack Israel when the Israelites were leaving Egypt. So in 1st Samuel 15, stick with me on this. He says God says this is punishment for what the Amalekites did back then. 400 years later after the attack, the command is to destroy an entire population, including children and infants who obviously had nothing to do with what happened centuries earlier. And even if some Amalachite adults had done terrible things, and they did, that still woul

dn't make it right or moral to kill infants who had done nothing. There's no excuse. And there is again Dr. Phillips comparing his idea of morality and justice against Yahovah in his limited human mind. He stands proud and says still wouldn't make it right or moral. Right? According to who is the question. So here he's directly accusing the most high of immoral acts and injustice. I need to show you this. This is a screenshot from my lesson on Nephilim that I taught many years ago. But what I was doing in this study, many of you probably have seen it, is I was attempting to show that the wars that we see Israel having in the Old Testament and the answers to some of these things like God is a baby killer and murder being justified with Phineas when he stabbed the woman and the Israelite man as they were engaged in sexual activities is all attributed to Nephilim. And I have this diagram here where I list the wars on the left hand side uh and who they were with Israelites wars. And then they all point over to the right side of known Nephilim tribes. What do I mean by Nephilim tribes? They had Nephilim DNA. What DNA? Well, the DNA created between angels and man and Genesis 6. Okay. So

it makes sense when the father tells say someone like Saul to kill everything. When you read the extra biblical books like Enoch, it tells you that these angels weren't just doing this with humans. They were uh violating animals as well, trying to create angel animal hybrids like they did with humans. So when the father says, "Go in there and kill everything. I don't want to see anything alive." Was it because he was a baby killer? Or was it because he was at war with this Nephilim DNA? This attempt on Satan's part to infiltrate the seed that would come and crush him. Genesis 3:15. You look at that list and what do you see down at the bottom? Amalekites. These Nephilim tribes. We cannot dismiss this. Okay, this is a integral part of understanding some of the more difficult things that we see in the Old Testament. The problem is some people are just unwilling to believe that Nephilim were real. Okay, that's part of the picture here. But aside from the Nephilim issue, here's my brief response to Todd Phillips in regards to this killing. Exodus 17, long before the events of 1st Samuel 15, as he said, 400 years, he prophesied that he would utterly blot out the remembrance of Amalek fro

m under the heavens. This was already prophesied long ago. Deuteronomy 25:19 states that this would occur after Israel obtained rest in the land. Why the delay? The delay shows us that the judgment was not an uncontrolled emotional reaction that so many people like to think that it is. When the father orders this attack, it's almost like he's throwing a fit, a momentary fit, a moment of haste, anger, rage. Yeah, rage. No. Amalek continued its hostility across generations of Israelites until the announced judgment arrived. It never stopped. From the moment that this was prophesied in Exodus 17, Amalek has a long history of interfering with uh waring against, rebelling against, killing Israel. What does this mean? Yah was not commanding Israel only to defeat Amalek. He had decreed that Amalek would cease to exist as a nation. the verse that we just looked at, he prophesied that the day was coming when they wouldn't just be defeated, they would cease to exist as a nation. The children represented the continuation of that nation into the next generation. Duh. We know that the judgment therefore reached the entire corporate structure of Amalek because the stated purpose of that prophecy

was to blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven. Now, when we say that, when we look at that prophecy and we realize the ramifications of what Yahovah is saying, that he's going to blot them out, that they are going to be gone, remembered no more, no longer a people, destroyed forever. What does that mean? The first thing we have to ask is who has the authority to make such a decision? I don't. You don't. David doesn't. Saul doesn't. Israel doesn't. No nation does. They don't have that right. They don't have that authority. You know who does? Say among the nations, Yahovah reigns. The world also is firmly established. It shall not be moved. He alone shall judge the peoples righteously. Only the father. We see that word righteously. He shall judge the peoples righteously. And we have to ask the question righteously according to who? Well, that's where we get into trouble. When we begin doing it by our own idea of righteousness, it fails every time. Yahovah's right to bring Amalek to an end rests not simply on the fact that he is more powerful than man, but on his unique position as a creator, giver of life, and judge of nations. Human beings possess life as a gift fr

om him. The only reason they're alive in the first place is because his spirit allows it. The only reason you and I are taking a breath right now is because his spirit allows it. Life is a gift. Yahovah does not possess life by permission from some other higher authority. He doesn't live because somebody else gives him the same permission that he gives us. Nor is he accountable to a moral law that exists above him. He is certainly not accountable to flawed human moral constructs. He is the source of life and the righteous judge who determines when individuals and nations and planets when you consider the flood have reached the end of life and the time allotted to them. He does that with you and I. I've had to deal with many funerals as of late. People dying all around me. Why? Why are they dying? Well, because the father decreed that that individual has reached the end of their life. Sometimes that comes sooner rather than later for some people. But just like he does it with a single individual, he can do it with an entire nation. He can do it with an entire planet. A nation therefore does not possess an inherent right to exist forever. The same God who permits a nation to arise ca

n judge that nation and bring its historical existence to an end. And he does and he did. So I mentioned the flood. Dr. Phillips, do you also object to that? Because the same principle is operating there on an even larger scale. If you argue that Yahovah has no moral right to bring a nation to an end as he did with Amalek, then on what biblical basis do you accept his right to bring an entire civilization to an end in the flood? That's what he did. All but eight survived the flood. There were women, there were children, there were infants and men, animals, all died. Where's the same righteous indignation to that? Again, you have to be consistent, intellectually honest. So, let me close with this. I'm sorry, guys, that today

Chapter 7: Conclusion and final appeal

there wasn't as much discussion. It seems to me, Dr. Phillips, that somewhere along your journey, you stopped allowing scripture to define justice, righteousness, holiness, and mercy on its own terms, and instead began judging scripture by a moral framework that stands outside of it. You repeatedly acknowledge the context, the covenant, the

Hebrew language, the legal distinctions, and the theological explanations, but then you dismiss them because they don't satisfy the moral conclusions you now bring to the text. By your own admission, the issue is no longer whether the passages can be explained from their context, but whether they conform to what you now consider morally acceptable. And as a side note before I read the next paragraph, that's what I find every time I offer biblical explanations to difficult things. I'm in the middle of it right now with Paul. I'm offering biblical explanations. They're right there in black and white for you to see. But people never address them. They never accept the explanations because in Dr. Phillip's case, they don't conform to what he calls morally acceptable. And in the situation with Paul, they don't conform to the worldview you've chosen

to have on Paul. Side note, sorry. And that, Dr. Phillips, is the deeper problem behind these 10 questions. You have not demonstrated that Yahovah is unjust in your questions. Not a little bit in my mind. You have assumed a standard of justice by which you believe Yah must be judged. You have taken concepts such as fairness, compassion, proportionality, innocence, human dignity concepts whose very foundation scripture grounds in the character of the creator and then elevated your own understanding of those concepts above the one who defines them. Deuteronomy 32:4 says, "He is the rock. His work is perfect. His all his ways are justice. We looked at this verse last week. A God of truth and without injustice, righteous and upright is he. The 10 questions, the 10 passages you've presented do not overturn that declaration, that truth. What they do show is something else. They reveal how dangerous it becomes when the creature assumes the position of moral judge over the creator. So I still hope and pray Dr. Phillips that you not only see part one and part two but that you're willing to engage with these. Yes, I understand that you have been tainted, jaded, burned by people who have tri

ed to give you pat answers about the father's sovereignty, thereby somehow granting him the right to do evil because he's sovereign. I applaud you in rejecting that nonsense. But in these last two weeks, we've attempted to give you actual biblical solutions. You just have to answer the question as to whether or not you'll accept them or continue down your path of deconstruction. So, those are my thoughts.

Chapter 8: Community Q&A and closing

Now, I want to open everything up to your questions, your rebuttals, your rebukes, if you think I need them. I'm still always open to that. Let's go with Matt Rambo. Good morning. Shabbat shalom, everyone. Um, morning. Excellent teaching as always. And I first want to uh to say thank you for Yahovah guiding you into doing this lesson. This is very good. Um something I would like to add as just a reminder. Most of us know this in this group. But if we go to Isaiah 28, it says whom would he teach knowledge and whom would he make to understand the message? Then he poses the question, those weaned from milk, those taken from the breasts, referring to babies, which Paul refers to the milk in the meat. Right? For it is command upon command, command upon command, line upon line, line upon line. Hear a little, there a little, to whom he said, this is the rest. Give the rest to the weary, and this is the refreshing. But they would not hear. But the word of Yahovah was to them command upon command, command upon command, line upon line, line upon line, here a little, there a little, so that they go and shall stumble backward and be broken and snared and taken captive. And what we see in this

is true for casual Christians who don't take Bible study seriously, who don't actually take the full council of scripture, as you have eloquently said so many times. And because of that, as Michael RDE would say, they take a snapshot or a numbered sound bite. Um, and then they run with that word or that phrase or that sentence as being the fullness of the meaning that is to be taken out of scripture, which is incorrect. And this is where guys like Dr. Phillips go wrong because they don't take the full council of scripture. So, thank you again for this presentation. It was wonderful. Oh, amen, brother. Thank you for your thoughts and your insight. Okay, Jim, you're up next. Okay. Thank you, Ed, for your teaching. And as usual, I want to chirp on every point that you brought up. And um not you, right? No. Um, okay. The first uh the first story that you brought up was the difficult question of Lot offering his daughters to the sodomites. Why? You know, I think there's a level of understanding to this story that um most of the church ignores. And

Yeshua clearly tells us to understand as it was in the days of Lot, so shall it be at the coming of the son of man. that Genesis 19 is in f

act a prophetic um storyline that will describe to us what society will look like. Not only the society that we, you know, we we peek through the blinds and we look out there and we see, oh my gosh, it's Sodom and Gomorrah, but the society that is inward. Uh that behind Lot's doors was a community of faith. And the story of Lot offering his daughters to the Sodommites is a prophetic picture of what the community of faith will be doing in the last days. And we reread that story is like, oh, ghastly, horrible. How could this possibly Lot, you you fiend, how could you be a righteous man? My suggestion is that um Christian men and women of the community and household of faith are actually offering their children to the sodomites through mechanisms of technology that we offer our children to the sodomites through entertainment. an example from my own life. My own uh stepdaughter and son-in-law um are offering their children to the Sodommites through taking their kids to a Disney concert. That there was some pop teenage hip-hop band that was, you know, a Disney concert. Wholesome. You know, what could be more wholesome than taking your kids to a Disney concert? Yeah. When my wife looked

at the lyrics of the songs that they were singing, they were all about witchcraft and rebellion and we were astonished. It's like, okay, how are you not offering your kids to the sodomites right now? Mom, dad, you know, through technology, through music, through entertainment, you know, we even have to be aware of what we are offering our children to in the educational system, in even religious systems that have become so influenced by Sodom and Gomorrah. You look at the men and women who run these um uh these powerful systems in our society. You start digging through their dirt and you find out they're sodomites. Every one of them, they're sodomites. They're offering um you know, blood ritual to the god of this world. They're taking over the the realms of of of society, education, politics, religion, economy. How are we not offering our kids to the Sodommites in the same way that Lot Yeah, we look at Lot. Oh, oh my gosh. How could you do such a thing? We're doing it. We're doing it. And my own kids are guilty of this. So, that's one thing, Dr. Phillip, that you might want to take a look at. Um, the second thing that I wanted to to chirp on was going back to last week when when you

were taking stories from the book of Job. um how Job's friends were operating out of an economy of justice that they understood. And one of my problems with the book of Job for so long has been I agreed with many of the things that Job's foolish counselor said. I've heard pastors teach out of Job chapters 1-37 and I've said yes and amen. And yet all of a sudden Job uh uh was it 37 or 38 where God says, "Who is this that darkens counsel? This is all rubbish. How do we preach out of the first section of Job a sermon? And I can agree with it. I can say, "Yeah, I get my head around that system of justice." And it's brought up in the book of Deuteronomy. It's like, you know, if if you do this, you'll be blessed. If you do this, you'll be cursed. I think what's happening and why why God doesn't even mention or answer Job's questions of his suffering is that there's a second economy of justice that's high above our heads. You know, I I think of the analogy of light. From the star above our head, the sun, there's a bandwidth of electromagnetism that stretches from ultra low radio frequencies all the way up to um gamma and x-ray. They're not in contradiction with each other. But I think we

're operating on the radio wavelength bandwidth of justice. We look at that. We look at these Yeah. You know, you you live a good life, you'll be blessed. You live a bad life, you incur damage from the Almighty. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, get my head around that's that's like radio wave system of justice. It's real. It functions. But there's a system of justice that its perspective from the heavenly realm from the the high frequency realm is so high, so above our pay grade that it's hard for us to get our heads around. And I think these are the these are the conflicts that Dr. Phillip is having. He's operating on radio wave frequency of justice and going there. Yeah, there's no justice there. But we don't have access to that gamma ray level of justice that's happening in the heavenlies. Um that we're operating from a dust of the earth perspective of justice rather than the stars of heaven perspective of justice. And this is one of the things that we have to be willing to just in humility, you know, put it at the Savior's feet and say, "I don't get it. This doesn't this doesn't add up in my head, but I submit to your understanding of justice over mine. I'm a flawed, wrecked, sinful. It's

gra

ce that I'm drawing breath. So, if you want to take my my child, if you want to, you know, like you said, God has a has a time clock for all of us. And when it's time, you know, like David's child went at the time that God shows, all right, we're punching him out now. clock, you know, wow, okay, that kid died for my sin. Apparently, the Bible says that shouldn't happen, but you're God and you took my kid, and you know, I I can't do the math on this. I trust you with the math. You know, I I think that's the posture that we need to have in these difficult questions. And this this doesn't nullify Dr. Phillip. These are genuine real questions that people wrestle with. You know, how does this happen in my life? I thought I served a just God who loved me and yet I'm in this anguish, you know. So, there's a level here that we just have to submit to the authority of God. Um, you know, and also I was just going to mention real briefly, this is quick, um, that the women taken as spoils of war were brought into the household of faith. They would have spent their entire life in paganism worshiping devils. But they were defeated in battle and they were brought into Israel, the community of the

true God. And I even that what story of the woman who is taken as she's beautiful. She's taken into the Israelite community. She is humbled. Her hair is shaved. How is that not us? Wasn't there a conqueror who went into the world, found a woman that he found beautiful, and took her into his household, humbled her so that she might learn the ways of that's us. That's a metaphor for us. these these women that are taken captive as spoils of war is a picture of God's grace and in in removing the enemy of our own soul chopping off his head and bringing us into the household of faith is typology of exactly what happened to us. So anyhow I I could go on blah blah blah. Anyhow, enjoy. Take it for what it's worth. Amen brother. Thank you as always. Appreciate your insights and your input and yeah the whole job angle, bro. I you know I like you for so many years was confused by um Joel Job I like you would read the things that his friends were saying and thinking to myself amen that's awesome and then you get to the end of the book and the father rebukes all of them for the things that they were saying and I was like wait wait wait a minute what did I miss so I get that brother Samuel is her

e man we miss we we tried to incorporate you this morning uh you just were a little late But uh glad that you made it. You're up next. Shabbat shalom. Um yeah, I I I joined a little late to um to the fellowship. I I was taking care of um some things this morning and it, you know, I'm I'm sorry that I that I missed the opportunity to to chime in, but I think um what you, Brother David, and brother Tim did was was a magnificent magnificent job. Um and all praises to the most high for for this opportunity to to gather with with you and and the brethren and sisters and in Messiah. Um brother James, brother Yakov, everything that you shared very powerful brother because what what they'll do is they will they will introduce things innocently. Hannah Montana, Justin Bieber, Britney Spears. Okay, remember how they were introduced to us through the Disney pipeline and then look what they became. Think about Little Nas X and Oldtown Road, a very harmless song, right? And then look at what ensued afterwards. All of it. This is Babylon. What do you expect? Yeah. And when you feed yourself and your children to the beast, you get confusion. So Yakov, hallelujah for your words of wisdom. Um, as f

ar as Dr. Phillips is concerned, because we cannot probe into the hearts of men, we don't really know his posture. We don't. But we assume that his confusion comes from a genuine place. We assume that because we want to give people the benefit of a doubt because in the end all judgment belongs to Yahovah. He is the one who condemns. We do not. But one of the people in our fellowship posted something interesting that they saw in his video in terms of a number of horns that were in view of his camera. And sometimes what the enemy will do, especially once they compromise someone, they will have to give a nod to the fact that they are in allegiance with darkness. And you may not pick up on it because your mind is so focused on one thing and you're coming from a certain place because you may have certain struggles that you identify with in what's being presented. But there's always a meta message. Sometimes there's something subliminal that just goes right underneath. And if you are not careful and if you are not watching and if the discernment of the set aart spirit isn't upon you as you watch sometimes you will miss those things when presentations are given. But what we know is that D

r. Phillips who walked a Christian path decided that he had had enough. He had read enough and he's finally come to the conclusion that he no longer wants to follow the laws and statutes, the commandments of the most high. I get it. And I get that a lot of people come to that conclusion, especially from Christianity. But I'll say this, Dr. Phillips, if this is not a genuine struggle, if you are indeed a compromised man who gave up your walk in order to take part in the filthy lucer of this world. If you are presented yourself as a false prophet trying to lead people into destruction, woe unto you. Woe unto you. read all of the chapter of second Peter 2 because it is better not to have known Messiah known the knowledge of the truth than to be brought into the knowledge of the truth and then to return to your vomit. It would be better if you hadn't been born at all. So Dr. Phillips, if you are indeed struggling, you have to understand that the the information, the knowledge that you seek is notformational in the sense of something that you can study yourself into. Not in the sense of a of a of a of a Helenist or a Greco Roman. It is an intimate knowledge, a relationship that has to b

e built with the most high where your trust is in him and you start walking in imuna with a blind faith. Your vision is limited, but your trust is in Yahovah. And if you humble yourself, not puff yourself up with v with vanity, with vain knowledge. But if you humble yourself, the mysteries are revealed to you because the father withholds the mysteries from the proud. And all these people get these degrees. They go to their seminaries. They go to their Ivy League institutions and they think that their reading comprehension means that they understand the word of Yahovah. They do not. And I tell everyone within this fellowship and everyone who hears it, if you think you can just read yourself into this and get an understanding and think that you can stand in judgment of the judge, woe unto you. Woe unto you. Amen. Amen. Brother, thank you so much. I'm assuming you guys can see the screen I'm sharing. Can you? Yes. Yes, we do. I hadn't thought about what Samuel said um that one of the viewers noticed the horns in the background. There's a couple things that I noticed. Um I noticed the ram head over here on the right hand side. Is this just innocent artwork or could it be something else

? I don't know. Um, the picture on the left hand side here looks like an obelisk to me. Um, could that be innocent artwork? I don't know. Horns here that somebody mentioned. What are those? Yeah. I mean, who knows? Those could all be, you know, subtle hints to where he's leaning. Maybe there's other things there I'm not recognizing. I don't see. Uh but you can't you can't ignore it when you see it. But thank you Samuel. Appreciate your words and passion as usual. Brother Phillip, you're up next. So just a a metaphor. A father stands at the edge of his house and he watches his daughter who can't swim walk into a pond and watches her fall in. If that's the text we have, then that father is evil, right? I was that father. Okay? I told my daughter, "Don't go in the pond. Don't go in the pond without mom and dad." And I watched her. I was a trained lifeguard. and I watched her go to the edge of the pond and I hid behind a tree and I watched her wobble at the edge of the pond and I let her fall in and I snatched her out of the pond, told her she was okay and explained why I gave her that rule. Now, if you have all that background, I think I did the right thing as a father. And I think so

metimes in the Bible, we don't get the whole story. And uh that's where faith comes in. We have to trust in the goodness of our father and sometimes it's difficult to see especially with modern sensibilities. So that's what I wanted to share. Yep. Well, thank you brother. Appreciate you. Okay. Well, looks like we have exhausted our questions and our comments. Guys, thank you for being here today and being a part of this fun of answering questions. If you uh wanted to share something or say something but weren't bold enough to be on camera, I understand that. Shoot me an email. Shoot me a text if you've got my number. I'd be happy to engage with you on that stuff as always. But I hope you have a fantastic rest of your Shabbat. Be watching this week for the dailies as we uh as I go headtohead with some of these Paul haters. Uh, an interesting side note here this morning as I was reading through some of my comments. One person in particular said that uh I I'm paraphrasing, but he basically said, "I'm waiting into waters that I'm not strong enough to wait into or that I I'm in over my head somehow because of uh my lack of knowledge on Paul." So, I just told him, "Bring it on, man." But

, you know, bring bring your questions on, you know, challenge me as you will, and I'm going to be dealing with those this week in in um in my shorts. Why is this important? Well, gosh, believe it or not, there's more people out there that are Paul haters than I realized. People who are Torah pursuant who reject Paul. And that's just nuts. That's craziness to me. And we've got to reach these people. So, you know, these videos that I'm making aren't just for you. I'm making these videos for for you to share with with people in your life that, you know, to to lean this way so that we can um hopefully let the truth ring out on this stuff. But um Matt, did you have one other thing to say before we close out, brother? Yes. just to uh to comment on Paul. Um the real problem that we truly have with Paul is not with Paul's words. It's the fact that the Roman Catholic Church preserved certain letters in canon and they are letters. That's Paul writing to different communities in response to things that were going on within those communities. We don't have the initial letter that was sent to Paul. We don't have the information that was given to Paul regarding those uh churches, if you will. A

nd because of that, we have to be very careful when we read those letters because they're addressing specific things at a specific time to a specific community. And too often we will take that as personal as if Paul is writing directly to us. And that is a big problem within the church. Amen. Yep. I would agree. Okay. Uh, real quick, Mark, go ahead. Jump in there real fast. So, we'll have give you the last word. Ed, do you seem concerned that uh wasn't a lot of talk this morning because you hit the nail on the head. Second thought I had was is you also expressed so goodly, goodly, is that a word? That uh Yah knows Yah knows the DNA thing. He knows there's reasons for everything. Trust in Yahovah and his righteous judgment. And the third thing talking about the pictures behind there that to me that reminded me of the idols in our homes maybe that we allow trinkets. Uh everybody argues about what's an idol and do we worship it. If we were just to simply not allow even some of those things to enter into our homes, whether it be a picture or whatever, I think our righteousness would excel. I think so. All right. Well, good final word, Mark. Appreciate you. Love all of you guys. Thank y

ou so much. Have a wonderful Shabbat. Have a fantastic rest of your weekend. and we'll see you here back. If we don't see you during the middle of the week commenting on the shorts, we'll see you all back here next week while we're going to uh attack this slavery issue. I won't do it as a response to Dr. Phillips. Maybe I will, maybe I won't. I just I just think it's something we have to talk about. So, we'll do that in in great detail next week so we can understand that. Shabbat shalom everybody. Love you all. Shalom. Take care. Thank you. Shalom. Shalom. Shalom. Thank you, Ed. Thank you, everyone. It was wonderful. Amen. Wonderful.