

Response To DeCosta

William Bell

Jason DeCosta created an audio mocking Dr. Don K. Preston, and me after I sent Him a proposition and challenge for a written debate. In that response, he attacked our character, impugned our motives, and expressed his angst for the challenge. This is my reply to some of the things he said in His video. This is not exhaustive but addresses a few main points and issues.

Part I: First Things First

DeCosta claims I charged him falsely with having Adam under the Law of Moses. He claims that Romans 7:8-9 is not the Law of Moses but the Law in the garden.

“I was alive once without the law, but when the commandment came, sin revived and I died. And the commandment, which was to bring life, I found to bring death.” For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it killed me. “

But he needs to read a little further:

Therefore the law is holy and just and good. Has then what is good become death to me Certainly not! But sin, that it might appear sin, was producing death in me through what is good, so that sin THROUGH THE COMMANDMENT MIGHT BECOME EXCEEDINGLY SINFUL. “ (Rom. 7:12-13)

Now the law in this text is the same law mentioned in v 8-9. How did the law (i.e. the commandment) in the garden make sin more exceedingly sinful?

The only commandment that made sin more exceedingly sinful was the Law of Moses. That is Romans 5:12-21. For our purpose and for the sake of brevity, we quote the last three verses.

“For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so also by one Man’s obedience many will be made righteous. 20) Moreover the LAW [the COMMANDMENT] entered that the OFFENSE [Sin of Adam in the Garden] might abound. But where sin abounded, grace abounded more, so that as sin reigned in death [the CURSE], even so might grace reign through righteousness to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord. DeCosta agrees that man fell under the CURSE in the garden.

That is also 1 Corinthians 15:56: The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law. Now where does death come from? It comes from sin. That is the “law of sin and death which states, you sin, you die.” Where does the **strength** of sin come from? It comes from the Law of Moses. If you make the Law here the Law of the

Garden, then the CURSE is the CURSE of the Garden. But that turns things inside out, upside down, backside front, and front side back. It inverts the narrative of Genesis. For now we have Adam CURSED before the Law in the garden is given and he received the COMMANDMENT so he could sin by the commandment, to make SIN, and therefore the COMMANDMENT, more EXCEEDINGLY SINFUL than itself!!!

DeCosta (Sin of Adam)	The Bible
Adam was alive once before receiving "the commandment"	Paul was alive without the law once before the commandment came
Adam sinned before receiving the commandment and lived because Adam's sin was not imputed to him	God says those under the Law of Moses who were "little ones" and "children" did "today" have no knowledge of good and evil". Deut. 1:39, i.e. they were alive without the law once
Paul was born "knowing good and evil" i.e. he was under the law from birth.	Little ones and children in the time of Moses had "no knowledge of good and evil", i.e. were not yet held accountable to the law.
DeCosta is Calvinist in theology	Paul was not born a sinner, was not born knowing good and evil, was not under condemnation of the Law of Moses at birth
Little children under the curse of Adam, i.e. Adam's children and the curse of Moses, i.e. Paul	Paul was not born a sinner, and was not under the curse of Adam, nor Moses at birth.
The commandment came, [thou shall not eat] sin revived and Adam died	The commandment came, "thou shall not covet" (one of the ten commandments)
The commandment caused sin to be imputed to Adam making sin become more exceedingly sinful	The law came 2500 years after Adam's sin and made sin, more exceedingly sinful.

The law came saying something different than what happened under Adam. The law said, thou shall not covet, (Ex. 20:17). DeCosta's claim that Paul was already under the Law of Moses at birth, does help but only worsens his case. He therefore has Paul under the sin and curse of Adam and Moses at birth. If the curse of Adam fell upon all men, then the curse of Adam fell upon Paul. If the curse that fell upon Paul is the curse of the Law, then the curse of Adam is the Law. If the curse that fell upon Paul is the curse of the Law apart from the curse of Adam, then the curse of Adam did not fall on the Jews. But Paul said, the death that entered the world through sin passed upon all men.

So how can DeCosta, 1) eliminate Paul from the curse of Adam, and 2) claim that the commandment of Romans 7 is Genesis, and 3) argue from Romans 5 that death passed upon all men? He's confused, badly confused. That means no one fell under

the curse of Adam, not even Adam himself, and thus death did not reign from Adam to Moses. If death reigned, then sin reigned. Paul said so in v. 20, "that as sin had reigned unto death (the curse)! How long did sin reign? It reigned until grace came through Jesus Christ our Lord! I can't believe I'm making the same argument to a Preterist that I made in a paper I wrote to Amillennialists 38 years ago. If death reigned from Adam to Moses, how can DeCosta eliminate Paul from falling under the reign of sin and death [the curse] of Adam, and thereby the Law of the Garden? That's absurd and a direct contradiction of Scripture.

But let's also see what that does for the CURSE. DeCosta claims that the CURSE is the CURSE of the LAW. He cites Galatians 3:10-13. For as many as are of the works of the LAW are under the CURSE; for it is written, "CURSED is everyone who does not continue in all things which are written in the book of the LAW, to do them....Christ has redeemed US from the CURSE of the law, having become a curse for us (for it is written, "CURSED IS everyone who hangs on a tree").

Now if the Curse results from the LAW and only those who are under the LAW are under the CURSE, then it must be the case that ADAM, in his fall, was UNDER THE LAW. If not, then DeCosta and IO, must:

- 1) back off the claim that only those under the Law of Moses are under the curse, and or)
- 2) admit that the Law of Moses was given in the garden, for how can one be cursed by sin apart from the Law in DeCosta's view?
- 3) But if one is cursed by sin apart from the law, then the CURSE fell upon men BEFORE, and APART FROM, the LAW of Moses, which is my position.
- 4) That falsifies the doctrine of DeCosta and IO on this point and I'm leaving my PayPal address in the link below so he can send my \$500 check.¹

To reiterate the point, Adam fell under the curse when he sinned. Only those under the Law of Moses are under the curse, per DeCosta and IO. Therefore, Adam fell under the Curse of the Law of Moses in the garden. It's false, but that's the simple logic, of IO and it's not rocket science.

Yet, DeCosta denies that he says Adam was under the Law of Moses. Then if not, Adam is not under the CURSE of the Law of Moses. If he was not under the CURSE of the Law of Moses, under what law was he because he surely died from sin!

"For in the day you eat of it you shall surely die." (Gen. 2:17) But now that we are on this point, let's note a few things about the narrative in Genesis. The text says God formed Adam from the dust of the ground, breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and Adam became a living soul. Following that, the text says the Lord planted a garden, eastward, i.e. facing the east in Eden, and there he put the man whom He

¹ <https://paypal.me/rrcoc>

² Robertson L. Whiteside, A New Commentary On Paul's Letter To The Saints Rome,

had formed. Then it says the Tree of Life (TOL) and the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil (TKGE) was in the garden. Then he assigned Adam's spiritual work of keeping the garden, giving him a commandment, to not eat of the TKGE for in the day he ate, he would die, i.e. fall under the CURSE. (Gen. 2:8-17)

Adam disobeyed, ate of the TKGE, and died that very day. Did he sin? Yes. Did he die? Yes. Did he fall under the CURSE? Yes! Was that the LAW OF MOSES? No. Was the CURSE the CURSE of the Law of Moses? Only if you're IO, it is. The correct answer is no.

If the Law is not the LAW of Moses, how can the CURSE of Adam be the curse of the LAW of Moses? If the CURSE is of the Law of Moses, how can the CURSE under which Adam fell NOT BE the CURSE of the Law of Moses? How does one die from the CURSE of the LAW without the LAW that brings about the CURSE?

Now this proves that through Adam, all men fell under the CURSE of sin through the breaking of the COMMANDMENT by Adam, but they did not fall under the LAW OF MOSES, which later became the STRENGTH OF SIN, making SIN more EXCEEDINGLY SINFUL. Further that is how "death, the CURSE, reigned from ADAM to MOSES. Moses' covenant which came AFTER the promise of Abraham, simply made SIN, more EXCEEDINGLY sinful, making it ABOUND, and thereby magnifying what happened in the garden.

430 Years After Abraham, 2500 Years After Adam

The Bible clearly says the LAW OF MOSES came 430 years after the promise given to Abraham.

"And this I say, that the law, which was FOUR HUNDRED and THIRTY YEARS LATER, cannot annul the covenant that was confirmed before by God in Christ, that it should make the promise of no effect." (Gal. 3:17)

That's approximately 2500 years after all men were under sin, and therefore under the CURSE of Adam. Adam covers a greater scope of sinners than the LAW of MOSES. All who were under the law were in Adam, but not all who were in Adam under sin and death, i.e. the curse, were under the LAW.

Redemption From Sin

Now that we have proven that death, i.e. the CURSE from Adam's transgression fell upon all men, including, but not exclusive to those under the Law of Moses, this brings up the question of Abraham.

IO wants to deny that anyone needed redemption except those under the Law of Moses. They unwittingly therefore, **remove** the fathers of Israel, because not one

single one of them, beginning with Adam through Joseph, was under the Law of Moses. Therefore, neither of them was under the CURSE of Moses' LAW!

Now if the argument is true that only those under the CURSE of the LAW required redemption, why on God's green earth are Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph, included in the promise of redemption, resurrection, reconciliation, and restoration to God? (Heb. 11) Per IO, only those who are UNDER THE CURSE of the LOM needed reconciliation. Then how do they get Abraham, Isaac and Jacob under the Law? Do you see their dilemma? These guys are gone, gone with the wind.

If the CURSE is the curse of the Law, and only those under the curse of the law need redemption, reconciliation, and resurrection, per Michael Beiras, Michael Bradley, and Jason DeCosta, then the patriarchs were under the Law of Moses. How else could they fall under the *curse* of that Law? How else could they be in the line-up for redemption? But the doctrine that places the patriarchs under the Law of Moses is a false doctrine. Therefore, IO's implication and explicit teaching that only those under the Law of Moses needed and received redemption is false.

Consider further on the "Curse" of the Law, which is, "you sin, you die". In Romans 8:2-3, Paul said, "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God did by sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, on account of sin: He condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteous requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us who do not walk according to the flesh but according to the Spirit."

Remember DeCosta's point that the Law of Romans 7 is the law given to Adam? The Law of the Garden was the Law of sin and death. *You sin you die*. Romans 8:3 says the Law of Moses could not deliver one from the "*law of sin and death*". DeCosta's doctrine is that the *Law of Moses* could not deliver one from the *Law of Moses*! If the Law of Moses is the Law of "Sin and Death", then it could be stated another way. *The Law of Sin and Death* could not deliver one from the *Law of Sin and Death*!

It should therefore be clear, that the *Law of Sin and Death* is not the *Law of Moses*. *The Law of Moses* could not deliver one from the *Law of Sin and Death*, but the *Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus* could and did deliver them from the Law of sin and death. Now does the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ equal the Law of Sin and Death? Absolutely not! Those are two separate laws. Then it must be the case that the Law of Moses and the Law of Sin and Death are also two independent laws. The text teaches the failure of one law through weakness to deliver the saints, where as the other Law through the power of the Spirit could in fact deliver them, and it did.

Robert L. Whiteside wrote: "If we can determine what the law of sin and death is from which the law of the Spirit delivers us, we should be able to see what the law of the Spirit is. The death here mentioned is spiritual death, for in becoming a Christian a person is not delivered from the law of physical death. The law of sin and death

cannot be the law of Moses; for, taking verses 2 and 3 together, we see that the law of Moses could not do what the law of the Spirit had done. If the law of sin and death is the law of Moses, then we have Paul making the absurd statement that the law of Moses could not deliver us from the law of Moses! The law of sin and death is the law set forth in 7:23: "But I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity under the law of sin, which is in my members." To be in captivity to the law of sin is to be dead spiritually. Hence, this law of sin in our members is also the law of death. Freedom from that law is salvation. But the law of the Spirit of life makes us free from the law of sin and death—that is, it is that by which we are saved. In chapter 1:16, Paul tells us that the gospel is God's power for saving people. We conclude therefore, that the law of the Spirit of life is the gospel." It would be absurd to think that Paul started in to prove that the gospel is God's power for saving people, and then reach the conclusion that some other law saves us, or frees us, from sin and spiritual death."²

Abraham Is Our Father

That means also that since Abraham was not under the Law of Moses, he is therefore the father of those also who are not under the law, i.e. the uncircumcised non-scattered Israelite. Romans 4:1, is our text. "What then shall we say that Abraham our father has found according to the flesh?" This is a rhetorical question, the implied answer being "nothing" no thing, not one thing, not one iota.

In Romans 4:6-8 David prophesied of the man to whom the Lord does not impute sin. Then he asks, Does this blessedness then come upon the circumcised only? The apostles dealt with Israel only over 2000 years ago. Is the gospel for Israel only? Is redemption for Israel only? Is not Israel the circumcised? Paul went way past the United Kingdom before the division. He went back to the father, Abraham to disprove Israel only.

9) Does this blessedness then come upon the circumcised only, or upon the uncircumcised also: For we say that faith was accounted to Abraham for righteousness.

10) How then was it accounted? While he was circumcised, or **uncircumcised? Not** while circumcised, but while **uncircumcised**.

11) And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while **still uncircumcised**, that he might be the father of **All THOSE who BELIEVE, though they are UNCIRCUMCISED**, that righteousness might be IMPUTED to them ALSO,

² Robertson L. Whiteside, A New Commentary On Paul's Letter To The Saints Rome, pp. 167-8.

12) and the father of circumcision to those who **not only are of the circumcision, but who also walk in the steps of the faith** which our father Abraham had while **still uncircumcised**.

13) For the promise that he would be the heir of the world **was not** to Abraham or to his **SEED through the law**, but through the righteousness of faith.

If IO's doctrine cannot argue for the uncircumcised all the way back to Abraham, it cannot use Romans chapter 4 to teach IO doctrine. Paul clearly said the case of Abraham closes the case of IO doctrine. There were no scattered Israelites in the time of Abraham. Therefore, Paul is not discussing scattered Israelites in this text but uncircumcised Gentiles who were just like Abraham, the son of an Amorite Father and a Hittite mother.³ Now that can include any who were uncircumcised, be they scattered Israelites or Gentiles who were never under the Law like Abraham.

Now if you exclude those who were not under the law from the promise in Hebrews 11, then you must exclude Abraham. Michael Beiras posted a response to me of the **"26 Articles of His "Lack of Faith"**. Here are the last three.

- 23) Paul explains the resurrection was a promise to Abraham and his descendants (Acts 26:6-8 Rom 9:3) which is why Abraham Isaac and Jacob are mentioned as being present in heaven (Mt 8:11) and no one who preceded them.
- 24) Abraham and his descendants were promised to be heirs of the kosmos/world (Rom 4:13).
- 25) Israel is a biological name. Descendant is a biological term. Abraham as a father is biological. Sarah as a mother is biological (Rom 4:19, Heb. 11:11-12, 1 Peter 3:6). "In Isaac your descendants shall be called" is biological.

Now compare that statement with Jason DeCosta's statement: "I have never said that Israel only is about the Abrahamic **blood line!** Being Israel has always been **about being covenant**". "Foreigners could always come into the covenant." Michael Beiras says: Israel is a **biological** name. Descendant is a **biological** term. Abraham as [sic], **biological**. Sarah as a mother is **biological** (Rom. 4:19, Heb. 11:11-12, 1 Pet. 3:6). 'In Isaac your descendants shall be called' is **biological**.

Jason DeCosta has skipped a few classes on Israel Only but if that is true, Michael Beiras is a total high school dropout on IO. Not only does he contradict DeCosta, he contradicts Paul. The Seed Promise to Isaac was never "bloodline".

³ Ezekiel 16:3

“But it is not that the word of God has taken no effect. For they are not all Israel who are of Israel, nor are they all children because they are the seed [bloodline] of Abraham; but ‘In Isaac your seed shall be called.’ That is those who are the children of the flesh [bloodline] are not the children of God; but the children of the promise [faith/covenant] are counted as the seed. Someone should tell Beira to do the math. The children of the promise are counted as the seed. That means ZERO are counted for the bloodline. IO is bad doctrine and bad math. It’s goose-egg eschatology. “For this is the word of promise: “At this time I will come and Sarah shall have a son.” Isaac was a son by promise, not by blood. Abraham’s body was as good as dead, powerless and impotent. Sarah was barren from the womb. Neither had the power to produce a child. “And not being weak in faith, he did not consider his own body, already dead (since he was about a hundred years old), and the deadness of Sarah’s womb”. (Rom. 4:19) There was no “bloodline” flowing through the loins of Abraham into the barren womb of Sarah. Rather, they had faith in God’s promise.

Next, the math gets a bit more complicated for Beiras. Paul’s argument didn’t end with Isaac; it continued with Jacob and Esau, two bloodline twin brothers. “ And [that’s simple addition] not only this, [that means add them together] but when Rebecca ALSO had conceived by one man, even by our father Isaac (for the children not yet being born, nor having done any good or evil, [not by merit or demerit] that the purpose of God according to election [God’s own choice] might stand, not of works, but of Him who calls), 12) it was said to her, ‘The older shall serve the younger’. 13) As it is written, ‘Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.’” (Rom. 9:10-13)

Now if bloodline was the criteria for Israel, then how could Esau before he was born, and before either had done good or evil, be eliminated? He was Jacobs twin “bloodline” brother, yet he was rejected as Israel! God didn’t count bloodline!

Michael Beiras	Jason DeCosta
Israel is a biological name.	“I have never said that Israel only is about the Abrahamic blood line! Being Israel has always been about Covenant”.
Descendant is a biological term.	
Abraham as [sic] a biological .	
Sarah as a mother is biological (Rom. 4:19; Heb. 11:11-12, 1 Pet. 3:6)	
“‘In Isaac your descendants shall be called’ is biological ”	
Choose You This Day Which IO Speaks The Truth?	

Abel, Enoch, Noah, Rahab, Etc.

We have shown and proven above that IO’s (Israel Only) attempt to remove the

“uncircumcised” who fell under the “CURSE of Adam” apart from the Law of Moses outside the scope of the redemption “in Christ” fails. They are often fond of quoting Hebrews 9:15 as their favorite proof-text.

“And for this reason He is the Mediator of the new covenant, by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant, that those who are called may receive the promise of eternal inheritance.”

First, Christ is not the Mediator of the *first* testament. Moses was. Secondly, there is no redemption for Israel under the first testament. The reason they are being redeemed from it, i.e. from the Law is because it was bankrupt as far as redemption was concerned. The redemption is for those who are “**called**” in Christ. “In Him, we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace. (Ephesians 1:7)

We have proven the promise was to those who were uncircumcised before the Law was given. This included servants in Abraham’s house and those bought with his money, i.e. non-bloodline, non-descendants. So there is not one text that can be used to prove exclusive salvation for Israel Only per the IO construct, and thus IO’s “O must go!”. IO is therefore a totally erroneous and an indefensible construct.

But again, to reiterate and drive home this point, note: Since Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph were not under the law of Moses, they were not under the curse of the Law of Moses. If those who were not under the law of Moses, hence the curse of the Law, and thus not under the first testament could not be redeemed, then per IO’s logic, neither Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, nor Joseph could be entitled to the salvation, redemption, reconciliation, resurrection and the perfection of Hebrews 11.

The only way to include them is for DeCosta to argue they were under the Law, hence under the first testament or IO must admit that salvation by faith, i.e. by COVENANT, and not by BLOODLINE is established and true. That brings in every faithful uncircumcised person from Adam to Sinai. To eliminate one representative in Hebrews 11 is to eliminate them all, (a fact Rivers of Eden has been honest and open enough to admit in print, disassociating himself from *that error* of IO). These all died in FAITH, i.e. IN COVENANT PROMISE! Thank you DeCosta, and no thank you Beiras!

Reconciliation

DeCosta also claimed that I do not understand the concept of “reconciliation”. He said, unless one had a former relationship with God he cannot be reconciled. Well, I have proven above that Adam and his descendants all the way from the Garden of Eden to the Garden of Gethsemane—both under and apart from the Law—had a relationship with God. What all men did not have was a “national” relationship with God.

If men had a relationship with God, which DeCosta cannot deny because he places Adam under Law, and even before under sin, which is a violation of God's law, how can a man sin without Law? If Adam sinned before the commandment, he broke a law of God, imputed or not.

Thus the sin and the curse of death passed to all men. But all men were not under the Law of Moses, so sin, death and the curse passed also upon those apart from the Law of Moses. Therefore, all men were under the curse, [of Adam] though not the "curse of the Law" and thus all needed redemption from the curse of Death, because the curse of death was only *magnified* through the law that came later to give it more strength.

Part II: Timothy and Titus

Why does Paul circumcise Timothy, the son of a Jewish Christian mother, (a Diaspora Israelite) and a Greek father, because of the other Diaspora Israelites in the region of Lystra and Derbe? "Paul wanted to have him go on with him. And he took him and circumcised him because of the Jews who were in that region, for they all knew that his father was Greek." (1 Tim. 3:1-3)

Note, they went among the cities of the Diaspora Jews delivering the decrees that went out from the Jerusalem council. That council discussed whether the Gentiles needed to be circumcised. The answer came back 'no'! Now why is that? If these were Diaspora Israelites why weren't they all circumcised like Paul circumcised Timothy? The Scripture says he was circumcised on account of the Jews in those regions. That means the Diaspora Jews were circumcised or were required to be circumcised. Yet, the apostles and elders in Jerusalem determined that the Gentiles in the Diaspora, who were among the Jews not be circumcised. The Jews would be hypocrites to demand circumcision of the Gentiles when they were not. Peter had a similar inconsistency with the Gentiles, (Gal. 2:13-14).

Peter said God made no distinction between "us" and them, purifying their [the Gentiles] hearts by faith. Peter is speaking of all twelve tribes of Israel. The Diaspora Gentiles went up to Jerusalem with Paul to the conference in Jerusalem. They had a debate and the Judaizers lost. Peter's "us" verses "them" is not about Jews and Diaspora Israelites but about the twelve tribes of Israel, and those outside of Israel, i.e. the Gentiles. He concludes, "Now therefore, why do you test God by putting a yoke on the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." Peter wasn't speaking about the fathers of Jews only. He referred to the fathers of Israel who were under the Law of Moses. That included Diaspora Israelites.

Peter continues: "But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved in the same manner as they." (Acts 15:11) Now let's see what Peter, the apostles and elders prescribed for these Gentiles. "Since we have heard that some who went out from us have troubled you with words, unsettling your souls,

saying, “**You must be circumcised and keep the law**”—to whom we gave no such commandment. Checkmate! Where did God ever tell the Jews not to be circumcised and keep the law”? IO should be indicted on the grounds of impersonating Bible teachers. They are doctrinal frauds.

Peter said to teach the Gentiles to be circumcised and keep the law unsettles their souls. This whole Acts 15 story is argued from the springboard of Cornelius’ conversion. Michael Bradley borrowed the Hebrew Israelite false argument that Cornelius was a Jew serving in the army of Kittim (Rome)! Not! Peter said God gave the Gentiles the Holy Spirit, just as He did to us and made no distinction between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. Yet, these Gentiles were forbidden to observe the law or to be circumcised. The prominent brethren wrote a letter for distribution among all the churches, saying **DO NOT CIRCUMCISE NOR PRESCRIBE LAW OBSERVANCE** to the Gentiles. Cornelius was not a Jew.

Acts 21:20-28

Paul went up to Jerusalem to share his success among the Gentiles. However, he was charged with teaching Jews in the Diaspora against the circumcision of their children and against walking according to the customs [of Moses, i.e. the law]. Remember, Paul circumcised Timothy because of Jews in the Diaspora. It must therefore follow that these Jews were circumcised. However, he is charged with teaching them not to circumcise their children and that they should not keep the law. James required Paul to clear up this matter by taking the vow and offering sacrifices in the temple. Paul was to do this that all would be convinced that the charges were baseless lies. “Take them and be purified with them, and pay their expenses so that they may shave their heads, and that all may know that those things of which they were informed concerning you are nothing, but that you yourself also walk orderly and keep the law.” (Acts 15:24).

James said Paul needed to make a public statement and sacrifice to demonstrate that the rumors were false and that not only did Paul not teach such things but he continued to walk orderly and keep the law. Now the law taught all Jews to circumcise their children. Thus Paul would be a law-breaker for teaching the Jews to forsake Moses, and to not circumcise their children.

In the very next verse the decree from the Jerusalem counsel of Acts 15 is reiterated saying Gentiles should not observe the law. “But concerning the Gentiles who believe, we have written and decided that they should observe no such thing, except that they should keep themselves from things offered to idols, from blood, from things strangled, and from sexual immorality.” (Acts 15:25). Jews already knew these things and were taught them from their youth. No faithful Jews would be caught doing those things. Paul did not teach Diaspora Jews to change the customs of Moses or to forbid circumcision. How much sense would it make to say they were “uncircumcised” and did not follow the law?

Finally, there is Titus. Why did Paul not circumcise Titus since he circumcised Timothy? “And I went up by revelation, and communicated to them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to those who were of reputation, lest by any means I might run, or had run, in vain. Yet not even Titus who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised, (Gal. 2:3-4).

The Scriptures say Titus was a Greek. Titus, a Gentile walked freely in the Torah-free gospel without circumcision. Paul was demonstrating the same “Torah-free” gospel among the Gentiles in the Diaspora, that Peter was doing with Cornelius and other Gentiles in Caesarea and Jerusalem. Gentiles in Jerusalem walked freely in the Torah-free gospel without circumcision.

Titus was a believing Greek. Titus experienced redemption by the blood of Christ. Therefore, non-bloodline Israelites, i.e. Gentiles who were not under the law of Moses were both subject to and received the redemption, i.e. were reconciled in Christ. The Jews in Antioch were so intimidating that Peter and Barnabas and other Jews were guilty of misconduct on the matter, (Gal. 2:12-14). Paul remained steadfast to his Torah-free gospel for uncircumcised, non-Israelite Gentile brethren.

Paul wrote to Titus these words: “For the grace of God that brings salvation has appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in the present age, looking for the blessed hope and glorious appearing of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from every lawless deed and purify for Himself His own special people, zealous for good works. “ (Tit. 2:11-14)

Paul shows the grace of God, righteous living, salvation and redemption appeared to all men.

Part III: The Gentile Mission

Now that we have established that non-Diaspora Israelites were the “Gentiles” of Paul’s Torah-free ministry, what was their role? Remember, Peter said, “We [Jews] shall be saved in the same manner as they [Gentiles] meaning apart from the Law? Peter, in these words, prophesied the end of Judaism. He looked forward to the time when “Jews” would enjoy salvation without the burdens of the law. God demonstrated through the Gentiles that He granted salvation by grace through faith, not through the works of the law.

This is why the Gentiles fullness had to come in to Christ without the Law so the remnant of Israel could both acknowledge that the law was too limited a scope for redemption. The logic is simple. God saved the Gentiles. God saved Gentiles through grace and faith apart from the Law and circumcision. Therefore God saved men apart from the law. By observing what God was doing among the Gentiles, Jews would learn how God also would save Israel by grace, apart from the Law and circumcision.

This is the meaning of Paul’s statement in Galatians 3:13-14. “Christ has redeemed us [Israel] from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us (for it is written, ‘Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree’) that [in order that] the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles in Christ Jesus, that [in order that] we [Israel] might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.” Did you notice that? The blessing of Abraham came upon the Gentiles in Christ Jesus so that Israel [the twelve tribes] might receive the promise of the Spirit through **FAITH**, not by **bloodline**. Gentiles were not in Israel’s bloodline. Gentiles here cannot be circumcised, law-keeping Diaspora Israelites. Gentiles did not have the law. “For when Gentiles, who do not have the law...” (Rom. 2:14) They didn’t have it, were never brought under it, and the apostles forbade them to be yoked with it. God used the Gentiles to show Israel how He saves man by grace through faith—not by the works of the law. Romans 2:14 and Galatians 3:14 also demonstrate that DeCosta’s view on Romans being exclusive to Diaspora Israelites is an illusion. We have more evidence for that in future writings if necessary. That also strips the so-called defensible IO paradigm touted by Michael Bradley of any merit.

This text shows God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation, he who fears and works righteousness is accepted of Him. Gentiles received salvation through faith not works. While the promises were made to Israel, they would not be received under the law, or without the Gentiles who were essential to Israel’s reception of the Abrahamic promise.

Gentiles	Israel/Diaspora
No Circumcision	Circumcision bound and practiced, Matt. 5:19, Acts 15:20-28
No Torah-keeping	Torah bound and practiced
Children uncircumcised	All children circumcised
Titus	Timothy
Received Blessing of Abraham through Faith	Would receive blessing of Abraham through faith when law ended
Not under the law, Rom. 2:14	Under the Law
Not under the Curse of the Law	Under the Curse of the Law
Under the Curse of Adam	Under the Curse of Adam
Needed redemption/salvation	Needed redemption/salvation
Not Abraham’s Bloodline	Abraham’s Bloodline
Gentiles Were NOT Israel	

Part IV: Common Foundation: DeCosta Flunks Out

DeCosta claims he would take me to school on Romans 4. He again surrenders his IO position. He claims I misunderstand Paul, but watch his contradictions. He says the common foundation is the Seed and that the promise was not coming through the

Law, but through the righteousness of faith. Hello? Isn't that what DeCosta had just agreed to when he said Bell is right on that, i.e. TRUE Israel is by faith, and not by a bloodline? What's the problem here? I believe he paints himself into a corner in that burning house of his.

"To repeat, the common foundation here is the **Seed**. I agree. The promise was not coming through the Law, but through the righteousness of faith. That means through Covenant. I agree. That kills IO and DeCosta again contradicts Beiras' bloodline theology. If the promise is through the righteousness of faith, it is not through the Law. For if the inheritance was through the Law, **faith is made void**, and the promise of made of no effect. (Rom. 4:14; Gal. 3:18) Thus, the claim that redemption is only for Israel is to claim that Israel were the only ones who had faith.

So DeCosta wants to call me the "Master of Deception" after he tries a sleight of hand trick. This is the kind of "cunning craftiness" Paul said we would not fall subject to when the church reached its' fullness! (Eph. 3:14-15)

DeCoasta admitted that he agrees with Bell that TRUE ISRAEL is determined by faith. He said I was going off on a tangent then he said, "but he is right". Then where does that place DeCosta! It's okay to go off on a tangent, when it is the correct tangent and that's why he followed me!

Then he says he was going to teach me that the promise is by faith, i.e. the righteousness of faith and not through the Law. Then what is he teaching me? He's not. He's deceiving you with "sleight of hand" tricks that I said something different, yet he agreed that I said it before he ever mentioned it!

Part V: Who Is Israel?

Here is another lesson For DeCosta. Who is TRUE ISRAEL? Is it as Beiras and IO claims, i.e. the twelve tribes, inclusive of the scattered? Now there is something DeCosta didn't catch in my statement which is equally destructive to the entire IO construct. When I said, **TRUE ISRAEL**, I was pointing to the **TRUE SEED** of Abraham. Now **WHO** is that? Is it the twelve tribes? No, absolutely not. It is the **One and Only SEED of Abraham, the Lord Jesus Christ.**

Now to Abraham and his **SEED** were the promises made. He does not say, 'And to seeds,' [the twelve tribes, or the Gentiles] as of many, but as of **ONE**, 'And to your **SEED**,' who is **CHRIST**. (Gal. 3:16) Write that down ladies and gentleman. Christ was, is, and "Eternally AM" the one SEED of Abraham, yesterday, today, and forever.

Now into what Covenant do the twelve tribes or the Gentile foreigners that DeCosta says were always allowed to enter and become a Jew through circumcision **in the flesh**? Certainly, that is not the New Covenant, but the Old Covenant. What kind of Israelites did they become? They became "bloodline" Israelites or as "native born". DeCosta said it; **they shall be "native born"**. "Did you catch the power of that?",

native born, not “**faith**” **born**. The Law says it.

“And when a stranger dwells with you and wants to keep the Passover to the LORD, let all his males be **circumcised**, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as a native of the land. For **no uncircumcised** person shall eat it. **One law** shall be for the **native born and for the stranger** who dwells among you.” Ex. 12:48-49 A had **MIXED MULTITUDE** did so.

Remember, the Law, i.e. the Old Covenant is not of faith. DeCosta just admitted that above when he agreed with Bell, so he can't change horses now and try another card trick.

Now since we have established the **TRUE SEED** of Israel given in the promise of Abraham, this brings us to another question. When does Christ come to an end?

Ladies and gentlemen, the salvation of Israel (according to the flesh), i.e. the remnant, the blind or cut off branches of that fleshly seed, is not Christ. Those are the ones who are saved by Christ, i.e. by **TRUE ISRAEL**. In other words, **TRUE ISRAEL** had to save **native-born** Israel, and **the Gentiles**. It is not the end of **TRUE ISRAEL**, nor was he the **SAVIOR** of **Israel Only** any more than he was the **SEED** of Israel only. I have proven both from Scripture with the blessings of DeCosta.

Now watch DeCosta take back all he gave almost immediately after he says Bell was right, the promise was by faith and that I'm on a tangent. Here's a direct quote:

“It was by faith to those to whom the promise was made and nobody further”.

Now after first denying the promise was to Israel only, i.e. to bloodline Israelites, he jumps back on that horse, riding in two different directions. Remember how we established that Abraham was the father of the uncircumcised before there were ANY tribes of Israel? Remember how God sealed his faith BEFORE he was circumcised thus in uncircumcision and before Sinai?

Compare DeCosta's 180 degrees turn from Paul's inspired testimony.

DeCosta and IO	Paul – Galatians 3:16
It was by faith to those to whom the promise was made and nobody further.	Now to Abraham and to His SEED were the promises made. He does not say, “And to seeds,” [i.e. and to those] as of many, but as of one, ‘And to your Seed,’ who is Christ.’
To Those (many = bloodline)	To One
Choose You This Day Whom You Will Serve!	

For you are all the sons of God by FAITH in CHRIST JESUS [THE TRUE SEED, TRUE ISRAEL], for as many of you as were baptized into CHRIST [the SEED/TRUE ISRAEL] have put on Christ.

There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus. And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's SEED, [TRUE ISRAEL] an heirs according to the promise." (Gal. 3:26-29)

When DeCosta's decides at the last minute to use more sleight of hand tricks by attempting to disagree with me, he contradicts the Bible. He wants to say the promise is to Israel. He calls them the "**TRUE SEED**" but watch him to see if he will now deny it and say he didn't say it. Paul said you are Abraham's **TRUE SEED** only if you belong to Christ. That is the only "ISRAEL Only" doctrine taught in the Bible. It is Christ only, not as Michael Beiras, Bradley or DeCosta says, was the twelve tribes only. See his quote, before he charges I am misquoting him.

Part VI: Did TRUE ISRAEL Come To An End?

Now that we have established and proven from Scripture, that Christ is the only "Israel only" the Bible speaks about, it is necessary for us to examine whether or not He, i.e. Christ, comes to an end. I would like to see DeCosta prove this. Defeating sin apart from the Law, and for those under the Law, was the work of the pre-parousia reign of Christ. That is when he "delivered" the kingdom to God. Was that the end of Christ? Was it the end of TRUE ISRAEL? Was it the end of the kingdom?

First, let's examine the word delivered, i.e. paradidomi παραδιδομι, Strong's #3860 in 1 Corinthians 15:24. It means to "give over, hand over, deliver up, (Mar 4:12; 5:25; 10:4, 17, et. al.; to commit, commend, Acts 14:26; 15:40; to yield up, Jn. 19:30; 1 Cor. 15:24; to abandon, Acts 7:42; Eph. 4:19; to stake, hazard, Acts 15:26; to deliver as a matter of injunction, instruction, etc. Mar. 7:13; Lu. 1:2; Acts 6:14, t al.; absol. to render a yield, to be matured. (Mark 4:29)⁴

Thayer also defines it as:

To give into the hands of another 2) to give over into one's power or use; to deliver to one something to keep, use take care of, manager (Matt. 11:27; Lk. IV 6, to deliver one up to custody to be judged, condemned, punished, surged, tormented, put to death. 3) to commit, commend; 4) to deliver verbally; commands, rites, Mark 7:13; Acts 6:14; 1 Cor. 11:2; 2 Pet. 2:21; the tenets, Jude 3, the decrees to keep, Acts 16:4; to deliver y narrating, to report, i.e. to perpetuate the knowledge of events by narrating them, Lk. 1:2; 1 Cor. 11:23, 15:3; 5) to permit, allow; when the fruit will allow, i.e. when its ripeness permits, Mk. 4:29.⁵

⁴ Harold Moulton, the Analytical Greek Lexicon Revised, p. 302.

⁵ Joseph Henry Thayer, Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, p. 480-1

In earlier examples found in Corinthians, Paul uses the term to speak of having *delivered* the traditions, i.e. the gospel to the Corinthians. That did not mean he ceased to preach the gospel after teaching the Corinthians. In fact, he kept the “traditions” until the day of his death, (2 Tim. 4:6). In 1 Corinthians 11:23, he *delivered* what he received from Christ concerning observance of the Lord’s Supper. That also did not mean that he ceased to observe it after *delivering* it to the Corinthians. They now both shared in its observance.

Again, in 1 Corinthians 15:3, Paul *delivered* the message of Jesus’ death, burial and resurrection. He did not abandon or abdicate it once he *delivered* the salvation message.

In other words, *paradidomi* does not mean to abdicate. In each of these examples it did not mean Paul gave up and ceased to possess and teach the gospel. 1 Corinthians 15:24, likewise does not mean Christ gave up or abdicated his reign in the sense that it ceased. Rather, he “delivered it” [the reign] up to God from where it was taken in the beginning.

So, to understand the meaning of *delivered up* or delivered, we need to see from what was the kingdom delivered in the first place. In the time of Samuel, Israel desired a king (i.e. a reign) like all the nations, It displeased Samuel, yet God allowed him to grant the wicked wishes of the people. Wicked because God said, giving Israel a king like the nations was **a rejection of his reign** over them. This kingdom in the hands of Israel, was God’s permissive will but not His original Divine purpose or *ideal* will. (1 Sam. 8:1-7) It represented rebellion.

Later, he took the “king” from them, but did not take the kingdom. Hosea tells us, “I gave them a king in my anger and I took him away in my wrath”. (Hos. 13:11) God had promised that the Scepter would not depart from Judah until Shiloh (Christ) came. (Gen. 49:10) The **TRUE KING**, God’s original “ideal” will from the before the foundation of the world, was that He and Christ as Co-Regents reign over the Kingdom. The Lord said to My Lord, sit at My right hand, till I make your enemies your footstool.”(Psalm 110:1; Matthew 25:31) When a king in ancient times,



defeated his enemies, he placed their heads or images of their heads on the footstool under his feet to display the power of his reign and to indicated their perpetual subjugation. See the image to the left.

Hence David prophesied the SEED from his own body would rise to sit on that throne. (2 Sam. 7:12-14; Acts 2:29-36) Now in order for that to happen, Christ had to die to Israel, according to the flesh. The kingdom and redemption could not be fulfilled in the realm of the flesh. Jesus Christ was born of

the seed of David according to the flesh, but was raised according to the Spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead. (Rom. 1:3-4) In other words, God raised up Christ from the dead, so he could be God's Son in the Spirit. "You are my Son, today I have begotten you." (Psa. 2:7; Acts 13:33) In so doing, Christ became the rightful heir of the kingdom in the realm of the Spirit.

But what of the kingdom which was in the hands of Israel according to the flesh? When Christ came, Israel recognized Him as the TRUE KING, and in an attempt to claim his throne, killed the heir. This is what most usurpers did to the rightful heirs of a kingdom when they did not want to submit to His reign. This story is told in the parable of the vineyard.

In the parable, the landowner had planted a vineyard and leased the land to vinedressers. Then he sent his servants to receive of its fruit and they persecuted them. These were the Prophets. He sent more, they beat and killed them until the landowner said, I will send my Son, and "They will respect Him". But when they saw Him they said, "This is the Heir" let us kill him that we may "seize" his inheritance. They tried to take possession of the kingdom by force, so they took the Son, cast him out of the vineyard and killed him.

Now what happened to the vine dressers. Jesus told them the kingdom would be **taken from them**, and **given to another nation** bearing the fruits of it. (Matt. 21:33-43) This is what the delivering up the kingdom means. It means taking the kingdom, or delivering it from the hands of those wicked servants who operated in the realm of the flesh to whom it was leased, and who were attempting to take it by force. Christ, defeated those enemies, putting down all their rule and power, and delivered the kingdom back to its rightful owner. That is the meaning of delivering the kingdom. It would not be delivered until the landowner sent his Son whom he raised from the dead, to squelch the power of the Jews who had the kingdom. That's what the text means when it says, when he has put down all rule, authority and power. Then the end of the Jewish power and rule would come. That is when the Son and the Father would be Co-Regents in the kingdom. It would have been delivered back up to the Father, where it was before the rejection of God in the time of Samuel and to which it belonged all along forevermore world without end.

This is why we see the Bible speaking of the inheritance in the Kingdom of God and Christ, Eph. 5:5, Rev. 3:21, Rev. 22:3-6. The kingdom has no end, because the king has no end. The Father has no end.

A kingdom is a reign. A reign requires and demands a law. The law of the kingdom is the incorruptible gospel. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words will never pass away." (Matthew 24:35; 1 Pet .1:23-25) The heaven and earth refers to the vinedresser servants of Israel. The word of God is forever. A kingdom must have a King, but it must also have laws. The King and Co-Regent are eternal and immortal, 1 Tim. 1:17, 6:14. They have no end. The law of the kingdom has no end, (Isaiah 9:6-7; Lk. 1:32-35). A kingdom also requires subjects, i.e. someone over whom the king

reigns through the rule of law. The eschatological goal of the kingdom was for God's will to be done on earth, as it is in heaven, (Matt. 6:9).

Those are the descendants of which the Bible speaks. Again we ask, when did Christ (True Israel) cease? To claim that Israel has ceased is to claim Christ has ceased. Paradidmi was the kingdom coming to fullness so it could bear fruit, world without end. It is not the end of the kingdom. There are many more passages for that including Dan. 2:44, Isaiah 9:6-7, Isaiah 65, 66, Psalms 102:18, 25-26. The old heaven and earth would be changed, but the new world, i.e. Christ would **remain** the same, His years would not fail, i.e. would not end, Heb. 1:10-12. We'll expand on those texts later as necessary.

Christ did not come to quit, he came to sit upon his throne to render judgment in favor of the saints and against his enemies, and continue his reign for ever, Matt. 25:31. Having seen that the kingdom belongs to True Israel, who never ends it is time to take up one more issue before we close.

Part VII: DeCosta's "Conversion" To God Post A.D. 70

What I find most interesting about the IO camp is their incessant obsession and attraction with a God who has for all practical purposes left the world to go to, figuratively speaking, "hell in a hen basket". For the record, I do not believe the Bible teaches the common doctrine of hell. I have videos on that, and I highly recommend, a book by Sam Dawson on the subject for those who want to study that subject further.⁶ "

What is the attraction of the Bible as a dead religious book? I understand why people believe the Quran and teach it. I understand why people believe in Buddha or the Hindu religion. They either have a futurist eschatological view or believe that those religions are yet valid today. They have an WIIFM (What's in it for me?) point of view.

However, aside from futurists, why do those in the IO have any interest in the Bible, since for them, it is a book that offers them no more than the Quran, or any other book? Aside from it just being good literature, filled with fascinating stories, or mentally challenging exercises, they appear to derive some benefit from it that they cannot resist. Is this a longing in their hearts to know the God of the Bible in a more intimate way? However, for them it is impossible because the God of the Bible is a covenant God. Without a covenant, he cannot be known. IO lops off the covenant like a dead branch and casts it into the fire.

Seal Up Vision and Prophecy

⁶ Sam Dawson, The Teaching of Jesus From Mt. Sinai To Gehenna – A Faithful Rabbi Urgently Warns Rebellious Israel. Order from his website: www.sgdpress.com

Now let me say before I begin this point, that I am not here to speak negatively or disparagingly about a man's personal and very deep heart-felt longings for a relationship with God. I am only interested in the doctrinal implications associated with it. So, if anyone is offended, I apologize in advance for having to hold DeCosta to the same standard by which he "judges" us. I will not go deeply into this, but only to point out DeCosta's contradiction, confusion and inconsistency. He chides us for claiming a post AD70 relationship with God.

He claims that no one can have a relationship with God after A.D. 70. He also claims that all vision and prophecy was sealed in connection with that event. In other words, there are no more revelations from God. This is an uncontested view of Preterism, except for those formerly of charismatic backgrounds who want to continue the gifts and revelation beyond A.D. 70. He spouted:

"Basically, Mr. William Bell is a master of diversionary tactics, and what I mean by that is he will use his knowledge of historical events and his scriptural knowledge sort of like Jack Van Impe and he will blast the page with tons of irrelevant babble so as to take the focus off the elephant in the room which is that none of this even matters to begin with because the story concluded. If you couldn't tell that God hasn't given us any bit of revelation over the past 2000 years, and he's left us to decipher and pick apart ancient Hebraic and Greek texts to figure Him out. Gee thanks God!"

Friends, focus on two statements DeCosta made. Forget what he has to say about me as the "Master of Deception". Two lines from him say it all.

1. The elephant in the room...is that none of this even matters to begin with because the story concluded.
2. God hasn't given us any bit of revelation over the past 2000 years.

To add emphasis and proof, here is a quote used by permission. I chose not to reveal the name out of courtesy but the author of this quote did not object to it.

"William Bell...as a child I grew up in a Christian home, and that I also served in the ministry along with my dad who is a pastor over a Pentecostal Church. However when I came across preterism and began to realize the full implications of preterism, I began to understand the redemption story of the Bible which ended in AD70, pertains to Israel, and had nothing to do with me or anyone else since.

Overall the way I view life is to do good and the [sic] enjoy the one life God gave me knowing that there is one event to us all."

When I asked for clarification on whether this meant we simply live and die like animals without God, IO advocates responded in the affirmative with Ecclesiastes 3:18-22. All today is vanity. So DeCosta is not alone. Let's examine his statements. First, the ultimate bible view of Mr. DeCosta is that none of this matters. In other words, the study of the Scriptures as far as any benefit from God since A.D. 70 is an excise in futility. The word of God is irrelevant, a dead message, ineffectual to save

beyond a few short years even after it became fully revealed. Other IO proponents likewise hold this view.

In other words, the more fully the message moved toward completed revelation and fulfillment, the more impotent and temporal it became. See later how this contradicts a plain Bible passage. Before that fullness it could save not only all those of the first century who wanted in, but also all those from the beginning of the Creation who had opted in through faith. Then, in one hour, at the twinkling of an eye, it went limp forever and has been so for the past 2000 years and counting, world without end, forever. Since, DeCosta does not believe in the end of the material world, he and IO must believe in this case that forever, and “no end” mean exactly that. They are inconsistently inconsistent. This is all you get and this is as good as it gets, per DeCosta. That is his elephant in the room. It’s a mighty big elephant. In other words, God is dead. Israel is no more. Christ ceased. That’s his doctrine.

Michal Miano submitted a quote from Michael Bradley to the same effect. Speaking of IO he said it was:

“...the only view in over a thousand years that could kill Christianity forever.”

Whoa, this is a telling statement. Why in over a thousand years? Surely, he didn’t mean to say “Christianity” did he? This was a “Freudian quip” of the pen. You can’t kill what does not live. Isn’t that a bit of God-humor playing with the tongue of one of his “sons of unbelief”? It also partially reveals the “not-so-hidden agenda” of IO to Kill Christianity. How many have tried in the past?

These statements cause me to question who some of these men really are? Do we have Christian Zionists or Zionists who have infiltrated the ranks of Preterism? I believe I have heard a few of them refer to themselves as “Jewish”. Really? On what grounds IO? Why would you even think you could be one? They certainly have a heavily vested interest in “Jewish bloodlines”, as long as it is not the blood of Christ in dying for the church, against which Hades and death could not prevail.

I say this as a heads up. Those who know the history understand or should at least remember that it was the Zionist movement that infiltrated the Christian churches and gave us Dispensational Pre-millennialism and British or Anglo-Israelism, and the Hebrew Israelites, all of which are neo-Zionism influences. Authors of the Dispensational movement were high-powered Zionist “Jews” who financed the *Scofield Reference Bible* with the aim of infiltrating Christian churches. Look around you’ll and see how many of them have bought into the Zionist construct. How many Christian churches believe the lie of the Rapture doctrine? John Hagee is a Preacher supporting their movement of “Bless Israel, Pray for the Peace of Jerusalem— Jerusalem, mind you, not “New Jerusalem!

Let's examine DeCosta's second statement: "If you couldn't tell, God hasn't given us any bit of revelation over the past two thousand years". Okay, let's see how deeply Mr. DeCosta believes what he records on audio. Here is his statement from a Facebook post, dated, October 28, 2017, in response to a question I asked him about his "relationship" with God, and post A.D. 70 position:

Let's try this statement on for some good old IO consistency.

"I called out to God in a moment of pain and He answered me. I had never so much as picked up a Bible. He didn't "save me" that day. He showed me His love. The Bible is destructive to that pure relationship."

First, let that sink in. DeCosta said God hasn't revealed himself to anyone for 2000 years. Well, God made a mistake. He forgot Mr. DeCosta. Apparently, God revealed Himself to Mr. DeCosta after miracles ceased, i.e. the sealing up of vision and prophecy according to Daniel's 70 weeks, and after all the remnant of Israel was saved. Can't you see Him, touching God on the back of the shoulder saying, God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, you forgot one. Can you heal my pain? Can you comfort me? Can you deliver me out of my trouble? Can I eat from the **tree of life** that was only for the healing of the twelve tribes of Israel?

Then follow him. He says I called out to God in a moment of pain and He answered me. Really? Where'd you get that revelation that hasn't been here for 2000 years? How did you rummage through the ancient Hebrew texts and the Greek to find it? For God to speak directly to a man is call prophecy. It is a word miracle. It's Divine revelation. What could God do for him? Did you ask Mr. Bradley if you had permission to call on God while he's trying to "kill Christianity"?

DeCosta wants some love from the God he says ran out of love for the world in A.D. 70. He says all the love God had was for Israel only, and they were finished in A.D. 70, but he claims he received and receives—until he renounces that God spoke to Him—some residual love from God. Is that perhaps the love that abides with miraculous gifts and hope? "And now abide faith, hope, love these three; but the greatest of these is love" (1 Cor. 13:13) Now let's do a little math. Note his position:

God's Final Revelation, A.D. 70	DeCosta's Final Revelation A.D. 2000+?
I have not spoken to man for 2000 years! Vision and prophecy ceased in A.D. 70, Dan. 9:24; 1 Cor. 1:4-8; 1 Cor. 13:10-12; Eph. 4:11-16.	I called out to God in a moment of pain and He answered me.
	The Bible is destructive to a pure relationship.
	I can talk to God and he hears me after A.D. 70, I just can't have any sin, because the story is concluded.
Choose You This Day Whom You Will Serve!	

Faith ended in A.D. 70. There is no faith. Hope ended in A.D. 70. There is no hope. Love, the greater of them ended in A.D. 70. There is no love. But wait, God is love. Therefore, there is no God! Now perhaps Mr. DeCosta is thinking he can turn this around and say.

The full preterists say there is no faith. Well, there is one kind of faith that is no longer operative as far as redemption is concerned. It is the faith described in Hebrews 11:1. "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." Since those things are realized and we now "see" them in fulfillment, we don't walk in expectation of them for why does a man hope for what he sees (has realized in accomplishment), Rom 8:24-25? From that perspective, 'we walk by sight'.

Suppose he says full preterists say there is no eschatological hope. True, not because it failed, but because it was fulfilled. Fulfilled hope brings something into existence not previously existing before. "Hope deferred makes the heart sick; but when the desire comes it is a tree of life." (Proverbs 13:12)

Deferred hope maintains a present condition of distress and suffering, the kind DeCosta was having before the claim that Israel's God spoke to him. Had all things not come to their fullness, the tree of life in fulfillment would not exist. The *result* of hope remains. Once hope is fulfilled, it can never become unfulfilled. It is a logical fallacy to claim otherwise. Once a man grows up and reaches the "fullness of childhood" by becoming an adult, he can never become a child again under normal conditions. No matter how much he denies he is an adult, he is yet an adult. The only way to cease being an adult is to die.

The Scripture teach that the miracles were given for the church to grow from a child (nepios) to an adult, i.e. a full-grown man.

(1 Cor. 13:9-11)

"For we know in part and we prophesy in part. But when that which is perfect has come, then that which is in part will be done away. It is not the perfect (to telion, i.e. the full grown) that is done away. It is the imperfect state that preceded it. "When I was a child, I spoke as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man, I put away childish things".

Ephesians 4:11-14

God gave the gifts to equip the church for the work of ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect (telios) man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ; that we should no longer be children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the trickery of men, in the cunning craftiness of

deceitful plotting but, speaking the truth in love, may grow up in all things into Him who is the head—Christ. “

The emphasis on the text is maturity, not termination. There is something that ceases. It is not the church. It is the “childhood” development of the church. The church is now a full-grown, mature, perfected entity. Remember, that was also one of the meanings of *paradidomi*. See Mark 4:29.

Observe, they were coming to the status of “a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.” Here, the phrases are in apposition to one another, a “*perfect man*” is the grammatical and contextual equivalent of the “*fullness of Christ*”.

Now let’s break down the words in the text. First, is the word, “metron” μετρον, or measure. This is where we get our English word, metric. It means “measure, standard, Eph. 4:13, extent, compass, 2 Cor. 10:13; allotted measure, specific portion, Rom. 12:3; Eph. 4:7, 16. ‘Ek metrou, by measure, with definite limitation, Jn. 3:34’.

The next word is: Enoteta, ενοτητα, #1775 from eis εις, meaning into. Unity, unanimity, agreement.

Next, elikia, ηλικια, (a particular period of life; the period fitted for a particular function, prime, Heb. 11:11; full age, years of discretion, Jno. 9:21, 23; perhaps, the whole duration of life Matt. 6:27; Lu .12:25; otherwise stature, Lu. 19:3, Eph. 4:13,⁷

Pleromatos, πληροματος, # 4137 from pleroo, to make full, to fill, to fill up, Mat. 13:48; to fill to the full, Phil. 4:19; to cause to abound, to furnish or supply liberally; 2. To fill up to the top; so that nothing shall be wanting to full measure, fill to the brim, **b.** to perfect, consummate; a. a number: Rev. 6:11, until the number of their comrades also shall have been made complete, time is said...when a period of time that was to elapse has passed or when a definite time is at hand, Mk. 1:15; Lk. 21:24 **b.**to make complete in every particular, to render perfect. ⁸

From these definitions the fullness to which the church was destined was a point of measuring or standard for their maturity, as one would measure their age in years. Compare a teenager counting off the years until they reach legal age. This is indicated by elikia (ηλικια) to reach a period of life **fitted for a particular function.**

Note what that function is: That we should no longer be children and **carried about with every wind of doctrine.** But DeCosta says we haven’t had any doctrine for 2000 years. He says the church has no doctrine and the doctrine has no church. He scorns the idea that we have to search the ancient texts, and manuscripts in Hebrew

⁷ Moulton, Analytical Greek Lexicon

⁸ Thayer, p. 517-8

and Greek, truly a laborious, time-consuming process to truly understand the Scriptures. But the result for the church here is clear. Miracles were designed to bring the church to the point or fully developed state, where having complete Divine revelation; it can stand against any doctrinal attack inside or out. You cannot carry about a “raptured” church. A raptured church cannot defend the truth on earth. A raptured church is not subjected to the trickery of men. This all happens *after* the church grows into full maturity, after it reaches the metric or standard of the measure of the fullness of Christ. DeCosta and IO have the church disintegrating and evaporating in the atmosphere leaving those on earth with no defense against the tricksters nor any reason for it.

Now the “measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ” in consummation is the contextual and eschatological equivalent of the “shall be saved”, and the coming of the Lord, i.e. the Parousia. It corresponds to the state reached after the entire remnant has been saved and the Gentiles have come in. That is the result of the “unity of the faith”. They are eschatological equivalents. We have shown from Ephesians four that it was not the end, but the beginning of the true glory and power of the church. This is what God planned for the age and generations to come world without end. “That in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches for His grace in His kindness toward us in Christ Jesus.” (Ephesians 2:7) “Now to Him who is able to do exceedingly abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that works in us, to Him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus to all generations, forever and ever. Amen.” (Ephesians 3:20-21)

The Bias of Beiras

Above, we argued and charted Beiras’ “bloodline” view and how it contradicts DeCosta’s “Covenant by faith” view of true Israelites? Bieras made another interesting admission in his statement, ‘In Isaac your descendants shall be called’ is biological.” Note that he speaks of Isaac’s descendants (offspring or seed) to indicate this was not for Isaac’s generation only, but also for his descendants, i.e. those who would come after Him.

In Isaiah 59:21, the text from which Paul quotes in Romans 11:27, says its fulfillment brings blessings to Israel’s descendants. “As for Me, “says the LORD, “this is My covenant with them: My Spirit who is upon you, and My words which I have put in your mouth, shall not depart from your mouth, nor from the mouth of your descendants, nor from the mouth of your descendants’ descendants” says the Lord, “from this time and for evermore.” Remember, above we demonstrated that IO cannot accept the continuation of the material world enduring “forever” and “having no end” without contradicting themselves on this and other related texts. In fact, God uses the very material world as the proof that the neither the kingdom nor the descendants (the seed) would cease. “My covenant I will not break, nor alter the word that has gone out of My lips. Once I have sworn by My holiness; I will not lie to David: His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before Me; It shall be established forever like the moon, even like the faithful witness in the sky.” (Ps.

89:34-36. Observe also that God says he has sworn by his “holiness”. When God’s holiness ceases, the seed will cease. When the sun and moon cease, the kingdom will cease. God’s holiness has no end, and will never cease. Therefore, the kingdom, the seed, the king and neither the sun nor moon will cease. They are a package deal. If you get rid of one, you get rid of them all. If you keep one, you must keep them all.

When Beiras and other IO advocates speak of descendants of Isaac in Genesis do they limit those descendants to a single generation? Do they limit the promise to Isaac’s generation only? No, they understand the word “descendants” to mean successive generations.

Isaiah mentioned not only the generation living at the time of the Parousia. He also mentioned their descendants, and their descendants descendants, or grandchildren. “As for Me,” says the LORD, “this is My covenant with them: My Spirit who is upon you, and My words which I have put in your mouth, shall not depart from your mouth, nor from the mouth of your descendants, nor from the mouth of your descendants’ descendants” says the LORD, “from this time and forevermore.”

The prophecy teaches God not only put his word in the terminal generation, but also into the mouths of their children, and their grandchildren. The idea is meant, not to describe only two generations after the last days, but that this continues from that time forevermore, would without end. When we add this idea of God’s completed word to the work of the mature full-grown church we see that in contrast to the miracles of the first century generation, succeeding generations have the completed canon. Wayne Jackson, an Amillennialist, recognized the enduring nature of the church and the word of God. On Isaiah 59:21, he wrote:

“That this contains and allusion to the coming Messiah is beyond doubt since that is Paul’s application of this passage in Romans 11:26-27. Jehovah makes a covenant with those who turn from their transgressions (cf. Joel 2:28-30; Acts 2:17ff) and the abiding presence of the word of God with all generations of the spiritual seed (21). Spiritual Israel, the church, will be forever proclaiming the words which God has made known through His Holy Spirit.”⁹

To this end, and in view of imminent death, Peter wrote that the church would always have a reminder of the word of God. (2 Pet. 1:12-15) See especially verse 15: “Moreover I will be careful to ensure that you always have a reminder of these things after my decease.” If the word of God were only meant for a single generation, why preserve a useless document for the future? The Qumran community who certainly saw themselves as living in the last days, took pains and care to preserve the word for future generations. We literally have thousands of manuscripts recovered from them and even more from Egypt. Never is it stated that the Apostles were writing a history of the church as Josephus or Pliny. Though it contains some history and is a historical document, they were writing instructions for the people of God in the none-ending kingdom of God.

⁹ Wayne Jackson, *Isaiah, God’s Prophet of Doom and Deliverance*, p. 120

Jude wrote of the common salvation once for all delivered to the saints. "Once for all" is from "hapax" meaning, like the Latin, *semel*, used of what is so done as to be of perpetual validity and never need repetition, once for all."¹⁰ This is the same word used for Jesus' sacrificial death. "Who does not need daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifices, first for His own sins and then for the people's, for this He did one for all when He offered up Himself." (Heb. 7:25) The import of the text is the "continuing" effectiveness of Jesus' sacrifice compared to the daily multi-generational sacrifices offered by the Levitical priests. The comparison is time and number. Jesus offered "hapax" once for all time, so that it need not be repeated, nor would dying threaten its continuation. It far exceeds the sacrifices of the Old Covenant and its priesthood.

Mark 9:1: The last passage we enter is Mark 9:1, "For there are some standing here who will not taste death till they see [literally will have seen] the kingdom of God present with power. See is from the Greek *idosin* (ιδωσιν). It is an aorist 2 subjunctive. This statement is recorded in Matt. 16:28 and Luke 9:27. Mark's rendering is slightly different, in that he uses a verb that indicates seeing the kingdom of God, not merely as coming, but as having come and existing in that completed state. In other words, they observe the kingdom fulfilled, while yet on earth. Mark teaches that some who stood in Jesus' presence would yet be alive on earth, i.e. would not die till they had seen the kingdom prophecies fulfilled.

Summary and Conclusion:

So, we ask Mr. DeCosta to be consistent. If all has ceased, then why can't IO cease to be concerned with God and the Bible? Friends, here is what we have shown.

- We have shown that the Curse of Adam fell upon all men, not Israel only.
- We have shown in addition to Adam that the curse of the Law came 430 years after the promise to Abraham and applied only to Israel, as a nation, but without restrictions to individuals who wanted to join through obedience.
- We have shown that the Hebrews 11 shows men under sin, and therefore the "curse of Adam" yet who were not under Moses' covenant
- We have shown that the strength of sin was the Law, and that the Law was not the strength of itself.
- We have shown that Abraham and uncircumcised Gentiles were justified by faith in the promise before the Law.
- We have shown that True Israel is Christ.
- We have shown that the true SEED of Abraham is not many but "One", who is Christ.
- We have shown that the Christ is True Israel.
- We have shown that the kingdom did not end.

¹⁰ Joseph Henry Thayer, Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament, p. 54.

- We have shown that “paradidomi” ‘delivered up’ does not mean to cease or give up, but to deliver the kingdom from those who attempted to seize it by violence.
- We have shown that it is inconsistent for IO to claim all belonged to Israel and ended in A.D. 70, and then contrary to that premise, and outside of Israel, attempt to call on God for deliverance.
- We have shown at least one consistent IO believer who does not believe God has anything to do with men today, and thus, the common fate of all men is to live and die.
- We have shown that the church, Christ and the word of God have no end.
- We have shown that the IO paradigm is false.

Mr. DeCosta says a man who can't get his view across in a few words, probably doesn't understand what he's talking about. I wrote these words for those who don't understand how to respond to IO. I have shown that the IO paradigm is false. However, here is my position and I will await Mr. DeCosta's dismantling of it, if and when he can. My ultimate aim is truth, and if he has it, these are the problems I see with his view as I understand it and the Bible.

Jesus Christ is TRUE ISRAEL! Jesus Christ is Abraham's true SEED. He is no longer known by bloodline. Therefore, from now on, we regard no one according to the flesh. Even though we have known Christ according to the flesh, yet now we know Him thus no longer. Therefore, if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation; old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new.” 2 (Cor. 5:16-17)

Now the ball is in DeCosta's court. Destroy, defeat it, deny it if you can. There is no other and there is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. (Acts 4:12)

Now for those who like a little entertainment and humor, I have a special surprise for you in the link attached or below. Please watch all the way to the end. Forgive me this one time, for stepping beneath a bit of dignity and Christian decorum, but some times fools must be answered according to their folly. First, let me address DeCosta's demands.

Closing Comments: DeCosta's demands:

- 1) No, I will not agree to the lop-sided demands DeCosta makes and for him to admit one would be ignorant to do so and then even suggest after that admission that they are stupid demands is troubling. However, if he wants to do audio, he's free to do so. I will not be held to an audio presentation. I will write my presentation. If I decide later to record, fine. He can respond however he chooses for as long as he chooses. He is also challenged to argue, not simply a negative as he suggests, but an affirmative of his position. He

was challenged to a written debate.

- 2) It was expected that you, DeCosta clarify any points in your proposition that accurately represented your position. That is an accepted protocol of debate negotiations; so tweaking your proposition more accurately was expected. But thanks for letting us know that your position condemns Beiras' and other IO followers. "Covenant and faith is not "bloodline".
- 3) I suggested a written discussion because it saves time, is more accurate and eliminates all the ahs, ands, "you knows" and other remarks and distractions or technical issues. You'll see what I mean in a moment. Therefore we don't waste words. It also makes it easier to quote, by copying and pasting than by having to listen, re-listen to boring fire-truck sirens just to figure out what a person is saying.

There is a reason God chose written revelation over oral to communicate the most important message given to man. It prevents anything from getting lost, changed, forgotten, or easily tampered with, in the transmission. We can always fact check it. It doesn't change and if/when it does we can note it. The sciences of textual criticism have proven this to be the case. It can also be posted, shared and more easily accessed at times than video.

People can read it in quiet when they can't turn on or turn up the volume of a video or audio. The written speeches can then be recorded, giving maximum access in all media forms. It is a better option. Besides, I didn't challenge you DeCosta to an oral debate, but a written one as you state in your video. You even repeated my words. If DeCosta refuses the written debate that's fine. Then he and no one else should have a problem in my refusal to an oral, lopsided, self-admitted, deck-stacked suggestion as that proposed to me. What I proposed was both fair and reasonable and I stand by it.