

Christianity and Liberalism

Introduction

www.wildbranch.org Brad Scott

I have chosen to depart from our frequently asked question mode, to pursue a connection that I have pondered for quite a long time now. I happen to be a frequent listener of Rush Limbaugh. Now, before all the nasty cards and letters start coming in, let me take the time to make my disclaimers. I am not aware of what Mr. Limbaugh's personal religious beliefs are. There are times when he seems very eclectic and universal (Catholic) in his theology, and there are other times when he seems to have a very firm personal relationship with 'Jesus Christ'. Not with the Jewish Messiah of Israel, but rather with the typical western view of the Savior. But, setting that aside, he paints a very clear distinction between conservative and liberal thinking, and has a very profound grasp of reality. His revelations of liberal thinking are accurate and humorous. Let me remind our readers that the ultimate distinction is not between liberal and conservative, but between those who follow the God of Israel and those who do not. However, for the sake of the perspective of the next few teachings I would like to borrow some liberal insights from Mr. Limbaugh and compare them with what I see has happened to the Christian religion.

I would like to take some basic fundamental belief systems from American liberalism and compare them to a very western Hellenistic theology that prevails in modern Christian thinking. A belief system that is lawless, full of cliches, ribbons, buttons, and bumper stickers. A theology that is evolutionary, with little action and a lot of intellectual pointy-headed fluff. An organization that redefines terminology, appeals to emotion, and is more interested in defending itself than defending truth. Well, Brad that was a little strong. I am only telling it like I see it. Are all who claim the Christian title guilty of this? No, not at all. I have found that most of the leadership fits the bill, however.

I am going to use Mr. Limbaugh's list of liberal definitions taken from his second book entitled, 'See I Told You So'. We will cover one or two subjects each teaching. I would just ask that you evaluate carefully what I am saying, and take the time to honestly think about it. If you are a frequent visitor to this web site or have been to one of our seminars then you will have a better background to evaluate my ranting. There is one thing that I have taught over and over that I want you to keep in mind. The moral corruption in our great nation does not spring forth from satanism, the new world order, the new age movement, Democrats, Republicans, Bill Clinton, Hollywood movies, Oprah Winfrey, or Harry Potter. It rests squarely on the shoulders of a Torahless church and a doctrinal system that contains a lot of heat and no light.

LIBERALISM: BAD MORALS AND CHARACTER ARE SECONDARY TO HOLDING THE CORRECT VIEWS ON ISSUES.

The largest groups of liberal thinking in this country are in Hollywood, the media, our biggest institutions of higher learning, and in a handful of special interest groups. Unfortunately, these groups dominate our culture. But one has to ask if our culture created our religious institutions or did our highest profile religion create our culture. Rush Limbaugh is more right than wrong about his assessment of liberal thinking, in my opinion.

It was the President of this country in the decade of the 90's who became the poster boy for

issues over morals. It became obvious that a large portion of the population was more interested in what Mr. Clinton could do for them rather than his character or his respect for laws and the constitution. The liberal media was right behind him in promoting his politically correct views of abortion and the environment, over his lack of ability to tell the truth or even to obey the laws of this country. After unsuccessfully chasing Mr. Clinton down for 8 years, the rival conservatives had to admit that his views on certain political issues far exceeded his moral standards in the eyes of the general public. This was verified by the fact that even if Hillary's husband did not win the actual majority of votes in each of his elections, his equally politically correct vice-president did win the majority of votes.

So where did this "issues over moral standards" attitude come from? It is this writers opinion that our view of the God we serve is what establishes the foundation of our philosophy and behavior. We live in a religious culture that has theologically determined that Christ nailed Torah to the cross and that New Testament believers are now 'free' from the law. It should be no surprise, then, that drug abuse, child abuse, violent crime, suicide, abortion, immorality, and crooked CEO's would be part of America's great testimony. According to scripture, it is Torah that is the standard by which we measure what is right and wrong, good and bad, moral and immoral. But that is no longer the case, for YHVH's teaching and instruction no longer has anything to benefit the people. Torah had it's time and it's purpose, but we are in a new age!

Mal'akhi 3:14

"Ye have said, It is vain to serve God; and what profit is it that we have kept His ordinance, and that we have walked mournfully before YHVH of hosts?"

It is my experience with the 'Christian' religion and all of it's tentacles, that my views on certain predetermined issues is what establishes the validity of my 'faith'. If I am asked, "Do you believe that Jesus is your Savior and that He died for your sins?" and I answer in the affirmative, then I am a Christian. My answer to other issues are what confirm my 'walk' with Christ. "Do you believe in 'the' pretribulation rapture?" "Are you baptized in the Holy Ghost, with the evidence of speaking in tongues?" "Do you believe in the Trinity?" And finally the grandest affirmation of my walk with the Lord, "Do you believe you can lose your salvation?" To some denominations my view of the rapture is evidence of my walk with the 'Christ'. To others it is my view of the trinity. The answers to these questions are the 'fruit' of my Christian life. My desire to obey the commandments of the 'Lord' I profess is irrelevant. Morality and ethics as determined by the one who created us is relegated to the Jews. As a matter of fact, in Christian thinking, the more I desire to obey God, the less I am relying on faith. Why the great determiner of my faith is not whether I 'take up the cross' and follow the Messiah, but rather my response to questions 'about' the Messiah. Oh, I get it, it's the issues stupid!

LIBERALISM: CLICHES, BUZZ WORDS, RIBBONS AND BUTTONS

This aspect of liberalism logically follows our last commentary. Election after election after election we hear the same speeches addressing the same issues. The problems facing our culture today are basically the same problems thirty years ago, and some of them we have struggled to solve for a hundred years or more. Liberalism is notorious for slogans, ribbons and promises to be our parents and give us what we need. When a deadly disease strikes our nation, we all do something about it by wearing a ribbon or making a giant blanket. To solve our health care issues, we build more hospitals and design better health care coverage. We come up with slogans and catch phrases to deal with crime. "Hey! Take a bite out of crime". To solve unemployment, we give the unemployed just enough money to keep them from taking 'just any ole job'. Meanwhile, every election campaign continues to address the same problems. The black population of this country has overwhelmingly

backed liberal candidates for five decades and is still confronted with the same problems. Excuse me Monty! But I have picked door number one, eleven times in a row and have ended up with a dead llama every time. I think I'll try door number two this time!

In liberal thinking, it is the intention that matters. Liberal leaders depend upon the lack and the want of the populace in order to maintain position and power. If the needs of the common man are met, then their position and power is no longer needed. It is kind of like a psychiatrist actually curing his patient. The livelihood of the psychiatrist depends upon his patient coming back again and again and again. You see, as long as we care and we have love, that is what really matters. Care and love is expressed by wearing ribbons, coming up with witty cliches and slogans, and teaching the ignorant masses that if they keep on giving, some day their seed of faith will blossom and their ship will come in. (This is the real reason why lotteries were created)

One does not have to think too hard to see where this kind of philosophy came from. The modern church has historically followed the Hellenized world of the 1st century C.E. Sha'ul commented on this in his letter to the Corinthians when he stated that the Ye'hudim require a sign, but the Greeks SEEK after wisdom. Christianity is the great thinking religion. What you think ABOUT God is what matters, and we express those ideas with cliches and slogans. 'Jesus is the reason for the season'. 'There is a God-sized hole in your heart that only God can fill'. 'You need Jesus'. 'What would Jesus do?' 'No peace, no Jesus, Know peace, know Jesus.' All these sayings are conveniently displayed on t-shirts, buttons, bumper stickers and hats. When we wear these it means, of course, that we are a Christian. And how do we know that? Why this t-shirt says so!

There is something even more important to ponder. Sha'ul taught us very clearly that true love is not something you talk about in a three points and a poem sermon.

Romans 13:8-10

"Owe no man any thing, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath FULFILLED Torah. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any OTHER COMMANDMENT, it is briefly COMPREHENDED in this saying, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to its neighbor; therefore, love is the fulfilling of Torah."

Sha'ul is saying that to love means to obey the commandments. Messiah said, "If you love me you will obey my commandments." (Yochanan 14:15). So, according to historical Christian doctrine, who actually wrote the commandments? Hmmm! Now picture a typical Sunday morning in America. The pastor stands in the pulpit and begins to teach the congregation that true love is to keep Torah and to obey the commandments of the God they say they believe in. He begins by starting at the beginning and teaching the Sabbath, promising to begin a teaching on the feasts as soon as the masses have figured out that the seventh day is not the first day. What do you think will happen? He will begin to lose his membership. (Which is really what it is all about). When his membership drops, his paycheck drops and he has a family to feed. Remember the psychiatrist? So instead, next Sunday arrives and he titles his message (slogan), 'For by the grace of God go I'.

Part 2

One oft quoted mantra of liberal thinking is the belief, albeit a self-serving belief, that the founding document of this nation is a living, breathing, and changing record. The idea is that the founding 'fathers' never intended for their words and formulations to be etched in cement. The constitution was designed from the beginning to change with the times. This supposition fits quite well with the recent tendency, especially in our 'thinking' universities, to revise history and convert it to politically correct thinking. Both of these perceptions fit like a glove with another popular American doctrine, evolution.

Many of the main issues of the liberal platform do not conform to the 'idealism' of the founding fathers. Instead of pursuing criminals that use a gun in the act of a crime, liberals attack the 'real' meaning of the 2nd amendment. When God or 'Jesus' is mentioned in a public arena, the 'lack' of any real religious conviction of the signers of the constitution is brought up. The constitution was reviled during the election scandal in Florida last year. I know I have broached this subject many times, but why is it that grown thinking adults can look at the same words of the 1st amendment and come to two totally different conclusions. Someone asked Dr. Walter Williams, the renowned professor of economics at Georgetown University, why he could not understand that the constitution was a living document. Dr. Williams response was classic. "How would you like to play poker with me using living rules?"

The founding document of this nation has come under relentless attack in my lifetime. It seems that the best way to change the present is to repudiate the past. This is how all great revolutions succeed. It is also how great religions get their start. It is best done by criticizing your antecedent. It is only logical that the reason for starting something new is because of the failure of the old. So we first begin to justify the new by condemning the old. Anyone wishing to dramatically change our way of government will never succeed by suggesting a new constitution. First we must patiently spend a few decades tearing down public confidence in the old constitution. History, of course, is one problem to be dealt with. So, we slowly begin to revise our history, by appealing to our multicultural nature. We change our public perception of the morals and ethics of the great men of this nation, thus villifying their motives and administrative capabilities. This eventually demonizes the whole governmental structure of the archaic commencement of our country. The step by step change of the American paradigm must always be salted with an occasional patronizing comment reflecting an appreciation for the fact that the 'old way' worked very well for those living then.

This all fits very well with the theory of evolution. Remember when our great, great ancestors had fins and gill slits? Those appendages worked fine when we were tadpoles. But we have evolved and no longer need those things. They have dropped off (about four dispensations ago) and we have left them behind. It is time to enter the dawn of a new civilization. One that is not hampered by appendages no longer needed. We must not take our archaic constitution into our culture, but, rather, our culture into the constitution.

Where did liberal thinking get this paradigm from? I would suggest that perhaps it is following the lead of it's main religious institution. The testimony of virtually every 'church father' is riddled with condemnation of Torah and the obsolescent Old Testament. In order to institute the 'new' leadership, we must render the old as impotent. Christianity's early leadership did a magnificent job

of repudiating the Old Testament, and thus was born a 'new' religion, an institution free from the legalistic archaic bonds of slavery to outdated customs and traditions. It has successfully taught that the appendages associated with our evolutionary ancestors have been removed and Torah has been relegated to the primordial soup ponds of the Law and the Prophets. Even the well documented gospel accounts of the birth of the Messiah has been revised to produce a yearly tradition that would be barely recognizable to those living in the 1st century. I take that back. Most Persians, Babylonians, Romans, Assyrians, Greeks, Wiccans and Druids would feel right at home.

Just like our founding fathers, Sha'uls doctrinal stand has been flip-flopped as well. A Torah-keeping Hebrew of the Hebrews has been revised into a Torah hating anti-semite. Which is a very liberal thing to do. By showing that Paul also had no regard for the law, this makes us all feel better about our disregard for it as well. I seem to remember a recent past liberal President that rationalized his immoral behavior by bringing up Thomas Jefferson's improprieties. How many times have I heard, "Well, hey! Jesus broke the Sabbath!" It seems to me that history revisionists and Bible revisionists have a common interest, and that is to justify the new by condemning the old. Just as it is with liberalism, many of the most popular doctrines and traditions of the modern church do not square with the early writers of scripture. So instead of taking God ordained scripture into our culture, we take our culture into the scriptures. After all, the scriptures are ever changing documents. Just ask any dispensationalist.

Shalom Alechem!

Part 3

I feel it necessary to elaborate for a few moments on the subject of liberalism versus conservatism. Although I find it more than compelling to draw the obvious parallels between modern 'Christian' thinking and liberalism, I am in no way placing any stamp of approval on much of what is considered conservative positions. It is just that most liberal thinking is too easy to ignore. However, when a person's morals, ethics or behavior is contrary to the word of YHVH, then it matters not what his or her culturally accepted banner is. A man of God is measured by his God. The walk of a man of God is to be measured by the walk of his God. If a man is lawless, then his god is lawless. This is precisely why the 'god of this world' is called the lawless or Torahless one, and why his followers teach and do the same.

It is unfortunate that most of us measure each others values and morals upon what is generally accepted by the majority, rather than by the revealed word of our Creator. The conservative position still maintains that the majority of the people in this country are indeed conservatives with 'Christian' values and 'down home' heart of the country morals. The problem with that brings us to the question of what are 'Christian' values, and who defines what those values are? Does a conservative position translate to a godly position? Is a Christian position a godly position? Some of us may answer no to that, but that is the paradigm that is commonly accepted, and it is this knee-jerk model that irritates liberal thinking. It is my opinion that we need a third position. There is liberal thinking, conservative thinking, and then there is scriptural thinking. Let me give an example. How many times have you heard someone tell you about a movie they saw, and describe it as the classic struggle between good and evil? I have even

listened to 'Christian' brothers defend a particularly violent or downright demonic movie by saying that it was not a bad movie because it was all about the struggle of good versus evil and good won! Can you see what is wrong with this picture? (pun intended) Yes! Good won over evil. But who defined what was good and who defined what was evil? The director? The writer? Before we move on let me ask another question. Is the movie 'Left Behind' from a scriptural point of view or a Christian point of view? What is good and righteous is defined by the written word of God, period.

Passing new laws instead of enforcing the ones that already exist!

This is the life blood of liberalism and liberal politics. It is basically job justification. Here's how it goes. After winning an election in your state, you immediately team up with like kind, while collectively praising the fact that your party won and FREEDOM has been restored to the masses. Like minded liberals then form an eternal committee to study a problem that will not go away. Being paid to pass laws, they draw up a bill that proposes new legislation to fix the problem. Some time after the law is passed another study is done which will always conclude that the previous legislation is not working. The eternal committee meets to study the matter and subsequently proposes new legislation, which is what they are paid to do. The object being, that whether the laws are designed to be enforced or not, the studies and polls will always indicate that they are not working. This is precisely why in every election we are confronted with the same issues. Passing new laws while ignoring the old ones only produces more committees to pass more laws. Another monkey wrench in this absurd merry-go-round is the constant changing of the guard, who by nature, want to make a clean sweep of their predecessors. This brings us back to our first installment of this teaching in which we discussed the demonizing of the antecedent. In with the new, out with the old. Hallelujah! Happy days are here again.

Where could this kind of thinking come from? What religion can you think of that has tossed out Torah, only to replace it (or Him) with more laws than you can count? What religion can you think of that has little or no problem with man-made laws, but jumps up and down in praise over our immancipation from God's laws? What religion can you think of that believes that 'Christ' died to put an end to the laws of God but not the laws of man? Am I being unfair here?

It has been estimated by learned men long ago that there are 613 commandments in the Tenakh. I would propose that if Adam and Chavah had obeyed the first commandment, there would be no need for ten more. It is also my proposal that if God's people obeyed the 'Ten Commandments' there would be no need for six hundred and three more. But this is not the fallen nature of man. Man has, from the very beginning, rejected the instructions of his Creator, only to replace them with his own, and then claim that he is freed from the law. The dominant religious teaching in this country it that we are not accountable to the 613 commandments of the Tenakh, but only to the tens of thousands of manmade laws. What is wrong with this picture? All we have done is replace God's laws with our own. Man has proffered a thousand reasons for turning away from the instructions of his Creator, most of which had come from our pulpits. You know, those 'elected' representatives of the masses. Those selected men and women whose very jobs depend upon pleasing the masses and passing new religious legislation. You know, those who actively participate in demonizing the 'Old Testament law' while creating a whole new set of sabbaths, festivals, rituals and

liturgy. Of course, that's what they are paid for.

What liberals know about conservatives, they learned from other liberals.

Recently, an ex-journalist named Bernard Goldberg wrote a provocative expose' on the liberal bias of the media. It was obviously a shock for us all to learn that the media was prejudiced. One of his revelations was that many news people do not really believe or understand that they are biased. This, Mr. Goldberg explains, is mainly due to the fact that most media people party among themselves and discuss the important issues from inside their own world. It is not that they are not out in the world, it is just that their perspective of where it came from and what it all means is limited to their own kind and those who already share the same world view. In other words, their view of those who hold a different opinion, is based upon intellectual exchanges with those who hold the same views as themselves. Kind of a circular reasoning, if you will. Besides the fact that this gives them a skewed view of conservatives, the most pathetic result is a skewed view of themselves. There is no way for them to validate their own beliefs. Let me give an example. A group of us are born and raised in a McDonald's restaurant. We had never ventured outside the dining area. Having been convinced that the whole world was red and yellow, I approach a fellow employee, dressed in red and yellow, and ask him his opinion of the colors of the outside world. "Well," he says, "I think it is pretty clear ...".

I was raised in the Christian church. I was told that the Christian religion is not really a religion, but is based upon a relationship with the Savior. However, all other religious systems WERE religions because they were not based upon a relationship, but rather upon the words of men and so-called prophets. Everything I knew about other religions was told to me by Christians. Everything I knew about Christians was told to me by Christians. All of a sudden I am craving a Big Mac. Anyway, let me share with you for a moment a small, and seemingly insignificant episode in my life. I had spent several years of my life a while back witnessing the true 'Christ' to the lost Mormons. After consuming a few hundred anti-Mormon tracts, I was now prepared to give 'um hell. There were all kinds of methods used to show that their prophet and their doctrines were not scriptural. By the way, their prophet and much of their doctrine isn't biblical. One thought provoking fact that we nailed them with concerned the ordinance of baptism that was clearly taught in a book that was supposed to have been given to Joseph Smith word for word, 600 years before Christ. You should have seen the looks on some of their faces when we told them that baptism did not come along till the New Testament. This was another nail in the coffin of Mormon teaching that proved that the book of Mormon was not from events that took place 600 years before Christ.

It was near or about this time that I made a deliberate move of my own, and dove through the takeout window. Hey guess what? The world is not all red and yellow and baptism was practiced by Israel long before the Messiah. Could it be possible that Christian theologians could be uninformed about other things? Could they have a bias? Is it even possible that they do not know everything?

Several years ago, I was explaining the meaning behind some of the Hebrew idioms used quite extensively in the Brit Chadashah to a friend of mine. He stopped me in the middle of my ranting and said, "Where in the world are you reading this?" Now, let me first explain that the question was rhetorical. What he was really saying is that what I was saying was different than what he had been

taught, so then by definition it must be wrong. There is no understanding of scripture outside of the state appointed, whoops, I mean, church appointed sources. Let me put this in a nutshell. Most Christians only hang out with other Christians. Most of what they know about the 'Messianic' perspective, they have heard from other Christians. They rarely ask you what you believe or teach because it is outside of their box, and is heretical at best because it is outside of the box. They cackle among themselves about it, and the next thing you know, you are wearing dreadlocks, dancing naked, getting re-circumcised and swinging chickens around your head. Am I a little harsh here? Perhaps.

Shalom Alecheim!

Part 4

Once again I feel it necessary to post a disclaimer of sorts before getting to the meat of the matter. For those who are interested, do not know me personally, or who have not bothered to email me, I would like to answer a question I get quite a bit, so we can get on with it. No, I do not believe that Christians are going to hell. I do believe that Christendom, in general, is a major part of Babylon, and that YHVH is calling HIS people out of it. There I said it.

Liberals believe that the common masses need the government because we simply cannot effectively take care of ourselves.

Liberalism is only interested in itself and hides this by appearing to be compassionate, concerned, and giving. Raising taxes and creating government programs is one of the great pillars of liberalism. 'We care' is their motto, and they show it by creating and sustaining government give-a-way programs and raising taxes to pay for them. These same taxes are pilfered in order to pay the salaries of those who are creating the government programs. This is another reason why the same problems are never solved and the budgets keep going up year after year. Government programs are not designed to solve anything or to ultimately help anybody. The smoke and mirrors of all this is that they believe 'we the people' cannot survive without these programs, and in the midst of our despair, Congress will rescue us with money. Just enough tax dollars to keep the destitute, destitute. The idea is to reproduce this attitude in future generations to keep the system going. The country's reaction to all this is to go vote for those who are giving us just enough money to keep us from taking care of ourselves. Doing what it takes to keep um comin' back works pretty good. It is actually a big dependency cycle. Our liberal leaders front the idea that we need them, because they really need us. "Tickle their ears and they will be back" is something the libs know always works.

I believe that the modern Christian church today is interested in herself and proliferating herself. It is my opinion that most evangelical Christians today are only interested in producing more evangelical Christians. Truth has been irrelevant for centuries and any teaching outside of 'accepted' doctrine is by definition wrong, simply because it is outside of accepted doctrine. The idea is to teach the masses just enough to keep them coming back. The whole apologetic is designed to defend the doctrine of the Christian church and not to defend the scriptures, much less teach Torah to the people so that they will be prosperous and prolong their days upon the earth. I do not believe that orthodox Christianity

has ever been in the business of a genuine search for truth, but rather to teach the congregation how to defend orthodox church teaching from the so-called cults. I continue to marvel to this day, as to how incredibly stupid I have been. I spent a good deal of my life defending an institution and not the truth, and the institution is dependent upon itself to propagate itself. I have found that it is very difficult to get people to break the mold. Which brings me to the next comparison of liberal thinking and Christian thinking.

Liberalism controls the media

It is a statistical fact that 84% of journalists and media types voted democratic and lean heavily to the left. What most Americans understand about the world around us comes from media sources such as the three major networks, cable news, newspapers, and magazines. Most Americans are still reading, and viewing on a daily basis, liberal perspectives on government, social issues, world events, medicine, marriage, crime, the earth, the universe, and the purpose of life in general. This is why it is so difficult to have an intelligent, civic dialogue on creation and evolution, or a real debate on abortion in the general media. Those who hold a creation position or pro-life stand are painted by the media to the masses as being kooks and religious nuts. Any ideas outside of the culturally accepted norms are rarely given a real prime time dialogue. When Bernard Goldberg attempted to expose this sad fact, his ex-cohorts in the media branded him as an anomaly and a deviation. I watched a few debates Mr. Goldberg was allowed to participate in and found myself viewing the same kind of response from his retractors as I have seen in 'religious' discussions. No one was really listening to what he was saying, but instead they were formulating their next response. This is how most interchanges go when two different ideas are being exchanged.

Let me take a moment and define a word I use a lot. When I say 'orthodox' Christianity, I mean the dictionary (Webster's) definition of the phrase, which is, and I quote, "conforming to the Christian faith as represented by the creeds of the early church." Could not have said it better myself. The medium by which virtually all Christian teaching material comes from is controlled by a handful of accepted publishers and two meccas, Dallas, Texas, and Wheaton, Illinois. The majority of Christian seminaries, according to research done by Zola Levitt's ministry, provide 1 Hebrew class for every 9 Greek classes. The bulk of Christian pastors and teachers being churned out by these institutions have comparatively little knowledge of Hebrew and the Hebrew culture. This is borne out for me personally in our seminars. Many times I am approached and asked what the Jew or the Hebrew background of the scriptures has to do with Christians. Sometimes my answer is 'you are right, it has nothing to do with you, I was only speaking of the Messiah and those who follow Him.'

The truth is that one can only output what one has inputted. The sea of Christianity can only teach what it has been taught. What it does not understand, it demonizes. I have found that many times I cannot even get to first base with someone before I am called a legalizer or a Judaizer. The instructions of YHVH from the beginning have taught us what is wrong and what is right. Try bringing up a single one of them and you will quickly be called some kind of name. I sense the same frustration with a liberal thinking person in trying to discuss our Creator's view of homosexuality. I am immediately called a homophobe. Why? Because they will not listen long enough to grasp what you are saying. All they know is that what you are saying is different from what they have been taught. I

have made it a habit that when I visit someone or I am invited into their home, I check out their library the first chance I get. What these people think and believe will be sitting on their bookshelves.

Shalom Alechem!

Part 5

Well, I am sure that I could go on and on, so we will conclude this little side step.

Liberals - Blame problems on everyone but themselves

This one was a little more difficult because conservative and so-called moderate thinkers are guilty of this as well. It just seems that liberal thinking is full of whining, and blaming others goes right along with whining. But, let it be understood that when anything goes wrong, the liberals blame the conservatives and vice versa. Moderates, of course, wait around to see where most of the chips fall.

The most obvious 'blamer' was our last President and his wife. If I blame someone else, it takes the focus off of me. If I do it long enough, I will have convinced myself of my innocence as well. Mr. Clinton was very good at that. Most of the Clintons' problems were the fault of a "vast right-wing conspiracy". Blaming conservative legislation for a bad economy is always quite convincing. Blaming SUV's for auto deaths and injuries, and the internal combustion engine for the destruction of the planet is quite popular. There has been more than a dozen attempts to blame 9-11 on the Bush administration or even President Bush himself. The down turn of Wall Street was Bush's fault, as was the collapse of several corporations. The antifreeze in my air conditioner is responsible for the hole in the ozone, not to mention my anti-perspirent and certain antihistamines. Apparently it is items that begin with 'anti' that seems to be the problem. Why is it that liberals see no problem with the 'antichrist'? High crime is blamed on poverty. Violent teens and school shootings are the result of videos and bullies. The source of sexual promiscuity and lawlessness comes directly from Hollywood. Gunshot deaths are blamed on the guns. When I carelessly dump hot coffee in my lap, it is McDonald's fault.

I get a mound of newsletters and emails from various Christian organizations every month begging me to contribute to their organization to help stop a variety of abominable practices that the 'bad people' are doing. Who are these lawless culprits? They are proponents of the new world order, new age shamans, people who read Harry Potter, Democrats, James Carville, abortion clinics, Martin Scorsese, San Francisco courts, Hillary Clinton, Larry Flynt, Mormons, Jehovah's Witnesses, communism, Ozzy Osbourne, and flag burners. Every week I get a letter pointing at the darkness and warning me that they are dark. The problems in this country are because of the darkness and those who are evil, they proclaim, and we must stand united against it. But darkness will only flee when there is light, and only when the light IS light will the darkness flee. The moral decay of this nation is because the vessels of light have little or no idea what light is. Hey guys, according to all the polls, the Christians outnumber the bad guys by 90 to 1. Perhaps there is too fine of a line between the two.

Liberalism is guided by polls.

Let's face it, the media is liberalism and liberalism is the media. Every night on the cable networks a poll is taken to see what the people think. Many times, when there is little or no juicy news, the poll results become the leading news item. My favorite polls are the ones in which the masses are asked questions concerning foreign policy, or whether we should go to war or not. Or how about quizzing the populace on their views of Israel and the Palestinians? How about the average citizens opinion on why the stock market is plummeting? The answers to these questions are taken very seriously by liberals and conservatives alike, and are especially important to moderates. Expert consultants are brought in to evaluate the meaning behind these polls. Here is a common poll result taken a few months back. The question was asked, "Who do you think is on the right side of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict? When the results came in, it was clear that America was behind Israel 41 percent to the Palestinians 28 percent, with 31 percent not sure. Wow! The commentators concluded, America is definitely behind Israel. So, what did this mean to the media? Well, there has obviously been too little positive coverage of the Palestinians!

Now, where do you suppose the idea of reacting to what the people think came from? Who has annual conventions and votes (polls) on doctrinal issues? Who concludes that the message must be right because, after all, look how much our church has grown? Look how many people we have. Who holds back the truth because it may run off the congregation? I know that there are mainline Christian pastors out there that visit this website. Ask yourself a question and answer it honestly. If one day you discovered that you had been following a pagan tradition by celebrating and even preaching sermons concerning Easter and Christmas, would you share that with your congregation? Would you teach them that it is wrong and an abominable practice according to scripture? If you had concluded that YHVH never commanded Sabbath to be exchanged for Sunday worship, how soon would it be before you moved your services to Shabbat? How many people would you have in your next service if you taught the faithful that Torah was for all of God's people for all times? You would not last a week, because as tradition is, tradition does.

I wanted to take a few weeks and blow off some steam. I know I sound very harsh and unrelenting toward the Christian religion. It is and will continue to be one of the main purposes of this ministry. Preparing the bride for her bridegroom is part of the stated function of Wildbranch. Playing our part in restoring God's Torah to a Torahless religion is why we exist. The ultimate conundrum is not between liberal and conservative or between Republicans and Democrats. When it is all said and done it will be the difference between the seed of the woman and the seed of the serpent. It is always between righteous and unrighteous, holy and unholy, the tree of life or the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. That is really the bottom line. And in the end it will ultimately boil down to those who truly have the Son and those who truly do not.

Hitgalut 12:17

"And the dragon was angry with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, who keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Messiah Yahshua."

Part 6

Alright, so I lied! I would like to do one more installment on this subject. It is just so easy to see the comparison between liberal thinking and the Christian institution, and it is the institution I am confronting. It is just that over the years I have slowly begun to realize that, for decades, I have been defending the beliefs and doctrines of orthodox Christian teaching and not the scriptures, and there is a difference between the two.

Liberalism has always maintained the idea that big government, the source of liberal leaderships' income, is our support and our 'parents', if you will. It is that which we become dependent upon to survive, not to thrive mind you, but to survive. Through big government and the media, liberalism creates the national paradigm. It defines our views of virtually everything from taxes to foreign affairs. Most of what the American public understands about the Middle East is spoon fed by the liberal media. Most of us have our views of 'secular' life formed by liberal thinking, and these views seem very natural and logical.

Mishlei 14:12

"There is a way which seems right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."

I believe that there are traditions, practices, doctrines and behavior in our dominant religious culture that 'seem' natural, logical and right. The religious institution I was raised in created the sacred paradigms of righteous living, and all my life it 'seemed' right to me. Personally, when I began to read and study the Book of Life, in the language and culture from which it was written, I quickly began to realize that governments and religious institutions are not my parents, and neither of them are going to define my world view. Liberalism and its traditions, practices, doctrines and behavior has much difficulty existing if the Constitution, our founding document, is interpreted in light of the language and culture in which it was written. The traditions, practices, doctrines and behavior of our dominant religion would melt away with a fervent heat, if the Book of Life, our founding document, were interpreted in light of the language and culture in which it was written. The first thing that each one of those institutions do is to render obsolete the lives and perspectives of the writers of both of those documents. It is an historical fact that 'new' paradigms cannot be created unless first the old paradigms be disparaged, demonized, and condemned. This is why self evaluation is not a prevailing activity in liberal thinking of most religious organizations. The dominant activity is criticizing and condemning everyone else. I suppose it appears as if that is what I am doing at this moment. There is one BIG difference. Our ministry is designed to play our part in bringing ALL believers in Yahshua BACK to the roots and model that they have cut themselves off from, just as Sha'ul predicted in Romans 11.

In Rush Limbaugh's second book, he provides a short lexicon of liberal definitions. I would like to use some of these definitions as a springboard for what I believe some definitions would be in the typical Christian lexicon. Here are a few examples.

The Liberal Lexicon: The Bible is a dangerous book that should be removed from school libraries.

The Christian Lexicon: The Old Testament is a dangerous book that should be removed from seminaries.

The Liberal Lexicon: Capital punishment is a cruel, unusual, and barbaric practice.

The Christian Lexicon: Capital punishment is a cruel, unusual, and barbaric practice typical of the Old Testament.

The Liberal Lexicon: Christopher Columbus - the originator of genocide, racism, sexism and homophobia ...

The Christian Lexicon: Moses - the originator of genocide, racism, sexism and homophobia ...

The Liberal Lexicon: The Cub Scouts - junior members of a subversive, homophobic, paramilitary organization.

The Christian Lexicon: Children of Israel - junior members of a subversive, homophobic, paramilitary organization.

The Liberal Lexicon: Contributions - government confiscating the American peoples hardearned income to increase government spending.

The Christian Lexicon: Offerings - church leaders confiscating the flock's hardearned income to increase the 'work' of the kingdom. (ouch)

The Liberal Lexicon: Earth - the source of life

The Christian Lexicon: Earth - the eternal home of the Jews.

The Liberal Lexicon: Faith - something you need a lot of to be a liberal.

The Christian Lexicon: Faith - the opposite of obedience

The Liberal Lexicon: A Father - a non-vital member of the family.

The Christian Lexicon: The Father - an almost irrelevant second banana to the son.

The Liberal Lexicon: Freedom -hedonism (living your own way outside the law.)

The Christian Lexicon: Freedom - hedonism (living your own way outside the law.)

The Liberal Lexicon: Chosen - liberals by virtue of being liberals.

The Christian Lexicon: Chosen - Christians by virtue of being Christians.

The Liberal Lexicon: Labels - what liberals try to stick on conservatives.

The Christian Lexicon: Labels - what Christians put on refrigerators, shirts, and bumpers as definitive evidence that there is a Christian on board.

The Liberal Lexicon: Litmus test - something liberal presidents, but not conservative presidents should use in choosing Supreme Court Justices.

The Christian Lexicon: Litmus test - the sinner's prayer.

The Liberal Lexicon: Morality - defined by individual choice.

The Christian Lexicon: Morality - defined by individual choice.

The Liberal Lexicon: Omniscience - the Federal Government

The Christian Lexicon: Omniscience - something only the God of Israel has, but is not taken seriously.

The Liberal Lexicon: Right - wrong

The Christian Lexicon: Right - something voted upon at yearly conventions.

Well I hope I have adequately stirred up things. Every day I see more and more evidence that these two entities are very closely aligned philosophically. The conclusion to all this is simply this; The God of Israel is my Father, and all teaching and behavior will be in harmony with Him and His ways. If it is not, then it is time to re-evaluate MY ways, and not to manipulate His ways.

Shalom Alechem!

About Brad Scott

Brad has been teaching the Scriptures since 1971. He began in the Lutheran system and was taught traditional "Christian" theology. In 1978, he began his studies in the Greek language and soon discovered that the well-defined Greek structure was NOT so well-defined. He soon began to learn the Hebrew language, and sat at the feet of Rabbinical scholars, much the same way Sha'ul may have done so! Having been trained that the New Testament was written in Greek, Brad discovered, along with other scholars of the New Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls, that the New Testament may well have been written in Hebrew. He has been teaching the Hebrew language and culture since 1983. Brad is an ordained minister through a non-denominational pastoralship

Brad is a professional musician, as well, and enjoys leading Praise and Worship teams and playing the keyboards and singing. Although he plays all styles of music, Brad enjoys the Messianic style best.

Brad and his wife, Carol, are available to conduct seminars, lead praise and worship and perform Passover seders.

Although he may be vertically challenged, he does have a good sense of humour.