The Myth of the Tithe

As it pertains to observing God's Law, and to the teachings of Jesus Christ.

“Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ.” Colossians 2:8

Section One
The Basics

Chapter 1
First Principles of the Tithe

Proverbs 3:9 tells us to “Honor God with your wealth”.
In 1Chronicles 29:17 King David said that willful giving “proves uprightness of heart”. 2Corinthians 9:6-7 tells us that “God loves a cheerful giver”.

There is no question that giving has its place in God’s Kingdom - both the Old and New Covenants are loaded with examples and references to freewill generosity. “Willful giving”, particularly to the needy, is a foundational concept of Christianity just as it was in Old Covenant times, but it was always a separate and distinct activity from tithing. So whether or not the tithe is valid for today, this study will provide no one with an excuse to selfishly hoard their money and thereby refrain from honoring God with their wealth by the proper scriptural means.

The main questions that we want to address in this book are: “Does God's law mandate that ten percent of all income is required of us today, as some people
would have us believe?” If so, the second question then becomes “To whom should it go?”

Congruent to that is the question: How exactly are we to “honor God” with our wealth? If you believe that tithing money to the church/preacher today is commanded by and pleasing to God just as I used to believe, get ready because you are definitely in for some scriptural surprises.

“Preachers”

The use of the word “preacher” in this book is meant as an all-inclusive word that applies to pastors, ministers, priests, elders, lecturers, or anyone else who speaks before others on religious or Biblical matters. In particular it refers to those who are paid, or have the intention of being paid money for their speaking efforts in any amount over their actual reasonable expenses. This includes anyone, whether an agent of an incorporated church organization (priests, pastors, ministers, elders, etc), or an unaffiliated lone operator of his own religious enterprise (independent preacher). My focus of course is primarily on “pro-tithe” preachers - those who promote the tithe as a means of leverage to get money from their audience.

Defining the Tithe: What It Was, and What It Isn’t

First of all, the noun tithe means a tenth. By definition that is all the word means - one part out of ten. It has no exclusivity whatsoever to Christian or even Old Covenant Israelite activities. The verb tithe means to deal with a tenth of something or divide it into tenths. You could tithe out a bale of hay to ten cows, for example.

Any ten-percent portion of anything is technically a “tithe”, though we usually do not call it that. If, for example, the Mafia puts the squeeze on a local business for ten percent of profits, they are tithing that business, and the business is tithing to the Mafia.
The general belief among Law-respecting Christians is that today’s tithe doctrine is simply the Old Covenant Law of tithing carried over and applied to New Covenant Christian life. This notion is completely erroneous, however. In reality, modern tithing has no similarity to the tithe instructed in the Old Covenant at all, except for the figure of 10%, and the name "tithe".

Pagan Origins

The subject of the tithe, though its history is rather deep, has been approached in pro-tithe presentations in a manner that makes it appear shallow and almost two-dimensional. With all the embellishments removed, the basic bottom line is that "Moses told us to tithe, Abraham tithed, so you should too", and that’s about all that we supposedly need to know about the subject.

The Levitical priesthood and the tithe designated for them by God’s Law did not exist in Abraham’s time so we have to wonder why Abraham just happened to pick the figure of 10% to give to Melchisadek (Gen 14:20), or why Jacob also came up with that same figure for his vow to God (Gen 28:20-23), since both occurred long before God gave a Law to His people instructing them to tithe to the Levites.

The reason as to why these two key Biblical figures offered their gifts in the first place will be discussed in later chapters. The reason that they each offered an amount equal to a tithe in particular is a bit less holy or dramatic than tithe promoters would like to admit.

Tithing was not an uncommon practice for taxation and tribute purposes in the ancient world, as well as being a voluntary act of respect or submission to deities, heroes, or government officials long before it was ever established for Levitical support purposes.

Tithing existed in many forms and for various purposes among the numerous peoples in the Mediterranean/Middle East area, during and before the time of Abraham. This is common knowledge to anyone who has researched the word "tithe" in most Bible dictionaries, encyclopedias (especially the older ones), and ancient writings.

"A history search will tell you that pagans also tithed to their gods. This practice was not exclusive to the Israelites."
For example, Melchisadek was not the only high priest and king that Abraham tithed to.

A common reference work is the Book of Jasher, which pro-tithe preachers are often familiar with. While it has its own peculiarities and weak points, every pro-tithe preacher that I have known has referred to it at one time or another to clarify details of Genesis on various subjects.

In the Book of Jasher chapter 15:8 it states “And Abraham and all belonging to him rose up from the brook of Mitzraim and came to Egypt; and they had scarcely entered the gates of the city when the guards stood up to them saying, ‘Give tithe to the king from what you have, and then you may come into the town’; and Abraham and those that were with him did so.”

So, why did the Egyptian king just happen to want a tithe? Was he a Melchisadek priest? A Levite, perhaps? Obviously the answer is no on both counts. It appears that a tenth is not the exclusive sacred financial figure of God that the pro-tithers want to make it out to be.

A history search will tell you that pagans also tithed to their gods. This practice was not exclusive to the Israelites. It is known that Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, Canaanite, Roman and other cultures often used the 10% figure for taxation, tribute and honorarium purposes for their heroes, as well as tribute to their gods. In fact it is also known to have been enforced in ancient Asian and Central American civilizations.

This fact is no secret. For example Smith’s Bible Dictionary when talking about the history of the tithe, states in part:

“These instances [Abraham and Jacob] bear witness to the antiquity of tithes, in some shape or other, previous to the Mosaic tithe-system. But numerous instances are to be found of the practice of heathen nations, Greeks, Romans, Carthaginians, Arabians, of applying tenths derived from property in general, from spoil, from confiscated goods, or from commercial profits, to sacred, and quasi-sacred, and also to fiscal purposes, viz. as consecrated to a deity, presented as a reward to a successful general, set apart as a tribute to a sovereign, or as a permanent source of revenue.”

In the case of Abraham being in Egypt it was a tribute tax placed on foreigners which was not related to income or increase at all, but on his then-currently held possessions.
Established reference sources like this tell us two things:

First, that tithing was in widespread use throughout the ancient world for a variety of purposes. Secondly and more importantly, it tells us that today’s church tithe on all income, in all forms (money, in particular), from all sources doctrine has its origins with the heathen nations and profane sources, not with Yahweh God of the Bible who specified a tithe of food items only. (see Chapter 2, “The One-Two Punch”)

The historian Flavius Josephus is generally considered an accurate writer and historian of ancient times. His works are often quoted as clarification and back up to scriptural research for Bible studies.

Josephus has several references of tithing, not only to Levitical priests, but also as a tribute to kings. Book XIII chapter 2, paragraph 3, and book XIV chapter 10 paragraph 6, to name a couple of the latter.

Maybe it has to do with having ten fingers, but ten is a pretty convenient figure since it is so easy to work with and calculate. It is also very profitable for the tithe-taker while it does not seem like too much for the tither to have to give.

So tithing, gift-tithing, and tribute-tithing in numerous forms, for numerous reasons, and to numerous entities was going on all over the place in Biblical times. Apparently giving a tenth for various taxation purposes was practiced so often that it not only got its own name as a noun (tithe), but also as a verb, (tithing).

I mean, what is the word for giving nine percent - “nithe”? Or five percent - “fithe”? These figures do not have their own commonly known names because they were not used often enough to require such a name.

Another example of tithing to a king is in 1Samuel 8:15 and 17 which point out the nature of kings and how they would take a tenth of the people’s property. “And he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his officers, and to his servants. And he will take your menservants, and your maidservants, and

"The point is that this tax/custom called tithing was in widespread use long before the Mosaic Covenant was established."
your goodliest young men, and your asses, and put them to his work.

He will take the tenth of your sheep: and ye shall be his servants. And ye shall cry out in that day because of your king which ye shall have chosen you; and the LORD will not hear you in that day.”

Why would these kings just happen to want a tenth? Were they Melchizadek priests as well? Not quite.

God was simply pointing out what would happen if Israel ever acquired a king. This warning was not just a prediction of the future, it was also a statement of observation based on the facts of what had already been commonly happening in the neighboring kingdoms up to that time. That is, the kings were taking and the people were surrendering 10% of their property for whatever the occasion called for.

The point is that this tax/custom called tithing was in widespread use long before the Mosaic Covenant was established. The cultures who engaged in this activity had nothing necessarily to do with Yahweh God or His People and their religious beliefs, but were instead often related to pagan religion, or were governmental in nature like Abraham’s experience in Egypt.

The Biblical Tithe

Then there is the tithing that many Bible readers are familiar with. This is a tithe as described in the Law of Moses in which the purpose was strictly limited to supporting the tribe of Levi, so that they in turn could conduct the extensive religious and civil activity of Israel. The terms and conditions of this particular tithe have little in common with the previous examples besides the fact that they all involve the figure of 10%. We will examine God’s Law on Levitical tithing in Chapter 2, “The One-Two Punch”.

Today’s Tithe

Today we have yet another tithe: It is a tithe that preachers repeatedly tell us has God’s full authorization for collection, and that in theory it is used to support His workers; which of course every preacher and his church organization claims to be. Just like the Levites were.

In reality however, the tithe doctrine that we see today is a genetically altered hybrid of most of the previously mentioned tithe concepts:
• It is a tithe that promoters assert has its origin in God's Law for ancient Israel (some preachers make the unfounded claim that it goes back to Adam). In reality however, the Levitical tithe was abandoned as obsolete by the Apostles and Christians of the first century. (See Chapter 7, "Hebrews 7")

• It is a tithe that was resurrected by the Roman Catholic Church, though most preachers will not readily admit this (see Chapter 22 "Rome: The Mother of Today’s Tithe"). That church organization then cross-bred the Levitical tithe of food items, with concepts from ancient pagan tithe cultures; developing a definite preference for cash.

• Resisted at first, this modern tithe gained its foothold of perceived historical legitimacy when it began to be enforced through that church’s partnerships with the reigning political forces (the king’s soldiers and constabulary).

This honey pot of coerced wealth proved to be so lucrative and psychologically effective for its Catholic creators, that it was eventually adopted as being scriptural hundreds of years later by a wide array of Protestant factions as well. It has become highly prized as a key commodity in the stock and trade of today’s commercial religious preaching industry.

Today’s hybrid tithe is claimed to have a Biblical basis, but unlike its true scriptural counterpart, the modern church tithe is extracted from any and/or all sources of income, profit, or gain just like some of the pagan/ secular tithes were. Thus, today’s tithe can accurately be called an income tithe. As we shall see, an income tithe, like its cousin the government income tax, is an entirely man made concept without any scriptural justification whatsoever.

The scriptural tithe went to a specific tribe of Levi, and for a specific purpose, as ordained by God. This modern income tithe is collected by self-authorized private individuals and church corporations and is used for practically any purpose that these entities feel like using it for.

**Giving and Offering is not “Tithing”**

The Bible has many instances of “giving” that people confuse with the word tithe. Some were freewill, (usually called offerings) and some are obligatory like the tithe was: sacrifices, various offerings (some of which are tithes, some
not), soldiers' ransom, first fruits, poll tax, peace offerings, heave offerings, etc, as well as a separate and distinct tithe for the poor, and even a tithe to yourself for feast day enjoyment. Deuteronomy 12 verses 6 and 11 list a few.

The payment of vows - a subject not often discussed - appears to have been a peripheral source of cash income for the temple as well, but this was not a tithe. See Leviticus 27, Numbers 18:16, and 2Kings 2:16, for examples.

Of these various offerings, many were designated for the priests only, and excluded the rest of the Levites (Numbers 18:8-18). Numbers 18:21 specifically differentiates the tithe as being that which is the common Levite's (as compared to "the sons of Aaron" - the priest class) compensation or reward.

Numbers 5:9-10 “And every offering of all the holy things of the children of Israel, which they bring unto the priest, shall be his. [the priest's] And every man's hallowed things shall be his: whatsoever any man giveth the priest, it shall be his.”

This description for offerings is very unlike the general tithe which was collected under the supervision of accountable Levites and priests, then taken to the storehouses, then allotted to individual Levites to take home to their families as needed. A person did not just hand the nearest Levite a few apples to put in his pocket and say "here is part of my tithe", as is done today when people hand the preacher a wad of cash. (See Chapter 12, "The Accountability Shuffle")

It is not our goal to get into the specifics of Old Covenant penalties and offerings, other than to point out that there was more involved and a lot more exacted of the Israelites under different circumstances, than just the ten percent tithe. The closely regulated tithe was only one aspect of a much larger tradition of sacrifices, extractions, and freewill offerings that existed during the Aaronic/Levitical priesthood era.

This knowledge is necessary to prevent the confusion caused when preachers take scriptures about offerings and wrongfully refer to them as tithes.

The tithe went to the Levites in general, and according to Leviticus the offerings went to the individual priests along with a specially selected tithe of the tithe that the priests in general got from the Levites, as stated in the scriptures cited above.

"...there was nothing generous or freewill about the tithe at all."
What you may not be aware of is the fact that, even though tithing was necessitated by the Law for that time, scripture does not define or refer to this activity as “giving to God”, or “honoring God with your wealth”.

Modern tithe theory has hybridized the compulsory aspect of the old tithe law with the laudable personal attributes associated with generosity and freewill giving, when there was nothing generous or freewill about the original Old Covenant tithe at all; it was mandatory.

Like a Fish Out of Water

Tithe promoting preachers will often flip-flop: blending together the offerings, sacrifices, and tithes one moment, and then drawing a hard line between tithing and freewill giving the next; but only if and when it serves their purpose.

In his lecture “The Law of the Tithe”, mega-tithe promoter R.J. Rushdooney, for instance, melds it all together by stating "No man could say he was 'giving a gift to God' until he gave above and over the Lord's tithe, and these were called 'free will offerings'".

In effect, people like this consider that anything you give to a church is payment on account toward your balance owed, and only after that alleged debt of ten percent of your income is paid, are you allowed the privilege of making any kind of freewill offering to God.

So, while pro-tithers take scriptures about freewill offerings and then present them as justification for promoting a modern tithe, some will also contradict themselves and clearly delineate between the two as it suits their purpose.

That audio, by the way can be listened to, and is for sale at http://chalcedon.edu/research/audio/law-of-the-tithe/

It is a textbook example of many of the techniques of wordsmithing, sophistry and deception that I examine in this book.

Identifying the Tithes

There were many tithes that did or do exist. So to avoid confusion we really need to sort them out and identify them for the purposes of this study:
• There were widespread secular and pagan tithes of money and property in the ancient world used for tribute, political funding, and personal aggrandizement and reward for certain individuals.
• There were tithes of food, property, and money for pagan religion activity.

We touch on these ancient worldly tithes in order to understand that they once existed, and to avoid confusing them with Levitical tithes. In doing so, we may gain an understanding of the true origins of today's modern tithe.

Biblically there were 3 tithes described in the Law according to Moses:
• A festival tithe saved by and given to yourself and shared with others for festival celebration purposes. (Deuteronomy 14:22-26)
• A poor tithe taken up for the needy which is generally understood to take place every third year, either in addition to, or in place of the regular Levitical tithe. (Deuteronomy 14:27-29)
• The Levitical tithe or common tithe of agricultural increase which went to feed the Levites, and which is the most often referred to of the Old Covenant tithes. (Numbers 18:21-22, Also see Chapter 2 The One-Two Punch)

In the category of Biblical tithes, there is no need to focus on the benign poor tithe or festival tithe, since the widows, orphans and strangers are not notably out to exploit a false tithe in order to defraud anyone today. For the same reason the tithe to yourself is not a big issue either. So these two aspects of the Mosaic tithe are for the most part not the subject of this study.

Finally, we have the Levitical tithe which has been co-opted to become today's modern church tithe or income-tithe:
• A heavily promoted tithe which claims its origin in the Old Covenant scriptures, but does not fit any of the conditions or description of a scripturally based tithe, except for involving the figure of ten percent. It is no longer “a tithe”, but is now The Tithe, the one and only. We could almost put a little “TM” after it.

"The subject of this book is primarily concerned with the modern church tithe, and how that tithe compares to the historically scriptural and legitimate Levitical tithe of old."
The subject of this book is primarily concerned with this modern income-tithe, and how that tithe compares (or doesn’t) to the historically scriptural and legitimate Levitical tithe of old upon which the modern tithe claims to be based. These are the two tithes that we will be talking about, unless specifically indicated otherwise.

The “Tithe” Misnomer

Tithe or tithing, though only one facet of Levitical Israelite culture, has been successfully instilled in Christians to mean any type of giving to a church. When the collection plate was passed someone may have said “I tithed ten dollars”, but this would be a misapplication of the word from a strict definition, unless the ten dollars was exactly one tenth of what he made that week. What most people are actually doing with their money at church in those cases is giving gifts or offerings, which have no relationship to a tenth of anything.

The Tithe is Not a Gift, and a Gift is Not a Tithe.

Technically and most specifically, the scriptural tithe was a mandatory offering of the heave offering type. It was an obligation to deliver one tenth of agricultural production to the temple after it was produced. This is as opposed to a wave offering which was a voluntary offering of a token amount that was made beforehand in anticipation of a bountiful harvest (or other request).

So “wave offering” was made in advance of a desired outcome, and “heave offering” was made after the fact. While the tithe was technically a mandatory heave offering, it is almost always referred to in scripture as simply “the tithe”.

I would challenge anyone to find a scripture that says that tithing is “giving to God”. This notion was invented by the Roman Catholic Church. They apparently wanted money while also making the assertion that they literally represent God on Earth. This misleading term “Giving to God” as it applies to giving to a church, has since that time become one of the most profitable concepts of advertising ever invented.
To equate tithing with offerings, sacrifices, alms, and charitable giving, etc., leads only to confusion, but this ambiguity is absolutely necessary for the pro-tithe preachers to successfully promote their position. This grey-shaded lack of clear definition about tithing appears to be widespread among the Christian brethren today. A true understanding of this subject cannot be achieved if all of these separate and distinct acts of contribution are mentally lumped together and vaguely mis-identified as *tithe*.

By blurring the line between Old Covenant tithes, offerings, and gifts, they can and do hijack scriptures on *freewill offerings* and improperly use them as examples to support a modern day *tithe* when in fact these scriptures do no such thing. Examples of freewill giving which are seriously abused for pro-tithe purposes are 1Chronicles 29:1-17 involving the building of the temple, 2Corinthians 9:7 on gifts for the needy, or even Cain and Abel’s offering in Genesis.

A blatant example is that of an internet/radio pastor who insisted that 1Kings 17:9-16 demonstrated the benefits of tithing, even though that scripture did not have one iota of tithing inference in it.

This is the story of the Sidonian widow woman (likely not even an Israelite) who provided the prophet Elijah room and board during a famine. She used the last of her oil and meal to provide her guest a cake or biscuit of some kind, and after that, her nearly depleted container of meal never ran empty and they had food for the duration of the famine.

The preacher went on to say that this miracle happened because of her “tithing” to Elijah; and that this sets the precedent for you to expect these same kinds of serendipitous miracles when you tithe (presumably to that preacher). I knew this preacher, and it is apparent to me that he knew better than to make a false statement like this as an honest error. This woman did not give Elijah a tenth of her meal; she used *all that she had left* as a gift to the prophet. So where does a tithe come into this story? In reality it doesn’t, but in fiction it can be placed anywhere they wish to.

**Yellow Preachers**

I call this type of behavior “yellow preaching”. It is a misleading, manipulative, irresponsible behavior, the name for which comes from the
**definition of “yellow journalism”:** The yellow press is a type of journalism that presents biased or little legitimate well-researched news and instead uses eye-catching headlines to sell more newspapers. Techniques may include exaggerations of news events, omission of facts, scandal-mongering, or sensationalism. By extension "Yellow Journalism" is used today as a term to identify any journalism that is indifferent to truth, and instead serves to manipulate sentiment rather than provide truthful information; or that treats news in an unprofessional or unethical fashion.

The basic concepts of yellow journalism relate directly to “yellow preaching” in that the same techniques are used, and that the purpose is not to inform or teach, as much as it is to manipulate an audience to achieve a desired outcome.

This is in many ways similar to “tobacco preaching” in which, like “tobacco science”, evidence in favor of the desired outcome is fabricated and exaggerated, while it ignores, conceals, and downplays evidence that contradicts their desired conclusion.

**Conflict of Interest**

The above statements bring to light the obvious potential for a conflict of interest that applies to the preaching of money-related subjects like tithing.

In other words: The outcome of the preaching affecting the income of the preacher.

The pro-tithe preachers routinely ignore the massive conflict of interest that they engage in when promoting the tithe. They try to deny or downplay the importance of this conflict by saying that it exists equally on both sides of the tithe issue and that these counterbalancing biases somehow cancel each other out and thereby negating any conflict of interest as being a valid issue.

This evasive maneuver of theirs is not true at all, however.

Unlike the professional tithe-accepting clergy, I personally have nothing to gain or lose financially by presenting this study or the outcome thereof. Scripture indicates that in order to stay on the sunny side of God's good graces, Christians by definition are expected to be generous in giving, whether the tithe was abolished or not. This type of giving can easily exceed ten percent. So what would be the

"In theory the potential tither/non-tither would have 10% of his income at stake on the outcome of this issue, while the preacher has up to 100% of his income on the line..."
difference to the average Christian if they gave to the needy, or if they tithed to a preacher? Either way the wealth has left their hands.

Because of this, the issue of self-interest is of a one-sided nature, and the problem of biased preaching is in fact huge.

The real heart of the issue, one that preachers dread, lies in the bigger picture that the tithe issue provides a gateway to: the question of whether or not the flow of this ever-present wellspring of Christian wealth and generosity should ever be directed toward preachers or church corporations at all.

The Bible abounds with scriptural prohibitions against paid preachers, and it makes this issue a very legitimate question and a real concern for all of us; actually dwarfing the tithe discussion.

If you are not aware of this question of whether or not anyone is to ever profit financially from preaching or teaching God’s Word, it is by itself evidence that biased preaching has concealed it from you, because this concept is abundant in the Word itself. Selective preaching has a massive influence on what you hear or do not hear from the pulpit. This will become even more apparent as we compare the pro-tithe arguments to what scripture tells us.

The pro-tithe preachers definitely have a dog in this fight; their whole standard of living is at risk. Even if this were a black and white issue of giving ten percent, or give nothing at all, in theory, the potential tither/non-tither would have 10% of his income at stake on the outcome of this issue, while the preacher has up to 100% of his income on the line.

One evangelist-preacher that I have known for years is quoted as candidly saying that his preaching business “stands or falls depending on whether or not the tithe is preached”. Yet he publicly proclaims that financial interests do not influence the slant of his preaching.

**Big Bucks in Jesus**

As an example of today’s tithe paradigm: A pro tithe “Kingdom author, teacher and evangelist” said that he had 1600 families on his list for bi-weekly CD mailings. This customer base is in effect his “congregation”, in addition to a small local one.
Let us say they had incomes of $25,000 per family (not per person), per year which is about poverty level. Let’s also say half of them tithed on their income the way the preacher has instructed them to. No, let’s say one-fourth of them tithed and the rest paid nothing; no gifts as we know many non-tithers today will offer, no purchases of tapes or cd's which is also common, no book buying or any other profit-generating activity. For this example seventy-five percent of that preacher’s customer base contribute absolutely nothing to this man’s business.

That is 400 families that actually tithe, out of the 1600. Take those 400 families times $2500 of tithe money (one-tenth of $25,000) per family, for a total of a cool million dollars to that preacher in tithe money per year.

No, wait - let’s cut that in half again, because you know how stingy and stubborn some of those Kingdom Israelite Christians are. So let us say that only one-eighth of them tithe as instructed, on a poverty-level income, and seven-eighths of the congregation do not give a single dime (what some preachers call free-loading parasites). So after cutting it all down, we still are left with a half-million dollars a year gross income for that preacher’s business.

Subtract this preacher’s overhead of 26 mailings of 2 cd's X 1600 on the mailing list for a total of 41,600, or let’s say 42,000 mailings at a cost of $1.50 each, which includes wear and tear on the equipment, postage, etc for a total of $63,000 in cost/expenses. Let’s round it up another 70% to $100,000 in expenses incurred for the year, just to be generous. That leaves $400,000 per year net profit for your preacher who claims he has “surrendered all for Christ”, tax free, year after year after year, for coming up with a 45-60 minute message, (much of it being jokes, small talk, and review of other messages) per week. Modern internet service allows for downloading the audio files, making most CD mailings obsolete and thereby increasing profits even more.

If you would like, cut the above figure in half yet again, to show I’m not exaggerating or being unrealistic, and it still comes to about $200,000 per year net profit. About eight times the income of the average congregation family income that we started with as a reasonable minimum; it could easily be double that, on up to five times that amount, depending on the prosperity of the tithers.
No wonder they love the tithe – a person could almost live on that kind of money. And they are trying to say that this money does not influence their tithe preaching? I mean, let’s wake up and smell the cappuccino latte supreme. Do not forget that even at this kind of income, a preacher like this feels “robbed” because in his mind he should be getting four million dollars a year, based on the above quoted numbers.

Furthermore, if you consider the incredible cash flow of the larger television, Christian radio, and shortwave businesses, including the world-wide internet ministries, you can be sure that they make this guy and his $200K annual net income look like a shoe-shine boy. This is particularly true when they advocate that people leave their estates to the preacher’s ministry/business (“eating widows’ houses” as per Matt 23:14, Mark 12:40 and Luke 20:47, an absolute violation of Numbers 27:1-11), and other such predatory-parasitic fund-raising efforts in addition to promoting regular life-long tithing.

The icing on the cake is that, due to their sweetheart relationship with the government it is all tax-free and they can also exempt themselves from the dead-end government deals like social security, Medicare, even Obamacare etc, that the average person is saddled with.

I bring up these numbers not to create class envy, but to show you how unrealistic and extremely lucrative this tithe racket is. But then, you already know this. Everyone knows it. The trouble is that while everyone knows it, they do not want to know it about their preacher because he is a “down-to-earth regular guy like the rest of us”. and people are clannish about this sort of thing.

Religion is a big business, potentially even for the local preacher that complains how tight money is. This kind of hard-luck story is often a ruse. What do you expect – that he’s going to show you his precious metals hoard or real estate portfolio?

Have you ever wondered where your tithe money is going – what it is actually being spent on? Do you see your tithe going for anything like soup kitchens, shelters or other missionary efforts for the homeless? Do you see funds for foreclosure or other legal defense teams to protect families from being victimized by criminal banks; anything that would benefit the congregation while...
it confronts the World Order? Something useful like the Apostles might have done to help the brother in need?

You may, from time to time see such activities, and they should be applauded because they are the relatively rare exception. Pro tithe preachers may point to humanitarian efforts like this, particularly when they achieve notable results, and take credit for them as being examples of the results of tithing, but do not believe it for one second without clear proof. Almost universally, charitable relief efforts are funded by freewill giving, not tithes.

Normally what you will see is tithe money spent and attention aimed at growing the preacher’s religion business. The goal of the enterprise is to spend more money to reach more people to get more money to reach even more people, etc. They buy more air time, to build a bigger church, more office space, high tech equipment, higher salaries and bonuses. This is all done in the name of spreading the Word, but with the end result really being - what? Obtaining a larger milking herd of a congregation? A larger flock of sheep to support the preacher’s lifestyle with their tithe that they thought was “going to God”?

Do you see any political or social action by these tithe-taking preachers at all? Not on your life! Not once they are established and prospering. With investment accounts, real estate, vacation homes and a hefty tax-free income, these preachers have too much to lose by rocking the boat and actually becoming a force for good in the community. Intentionally or not, they have sold out. Life is good in their gold-plated diapers, and they know it.

1 Timothy 6:8-10 "And having food and raiment let us be therewith content. But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition.

For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows."

We know these scriptures hit the nail right on the head. Most of us have seen the truth of this statement played out many times in real life. The "love of money" quote is axiomatic and the concept is recognized by nearly every culture and philosophy on Earth because this tendency is so prevalent in human nature.
Preachers can spend all day claiming that they are unaffected by this lure of wealth, but this lofty position of theirs certainly comes across as sounding pious and arrogant; as if this scripture (and many others) did not apply to them. This claim seems particularly disingenuous when it is made at the kick-off of any pro-tithe campaign designed to increase the personal wealth of the preacher making the claim.

We will see in this study if the veracity of their teachings agrees with their sanctimonious claims, and whether or not the tithe doctrine provides the perfect soil in which this root of all evil can flourish.
Chapter 2
The One-Two Punch: God’s Law of Tithing

Pro-tithers commonly label non-tithers as sinners (lawbreakers), and as being rebellious to God’s instructions on tithing. So let us address those accusations.

God’s Law clearly defines the tithe. Scriptural examples depict the true application of tithing. Together they provide for us two obvious facts that put the pro-tithe position down for the count before the discussion really even begins.

In your studies of the Bible, or histories like Josephus, or even in Bible dictionaries, or for that matter, in any factual reference source, you will find the following two scriptural confines of tithe law to be accurate and true: The Levitical tithe (not the poor tithe or festival tithe) is

- (1) Without exception only to be received by the tribe of Levi.
- (2) The Levitical tithe consists of food items only.

Let us investigate:

#1 - The tithe is commanded by God to be given only unto the tribe of Levi. Numbers 18:21-22 “And, behold, I have given the children of Levi all the tenth in Israel for an inheritance, for their service which they serve, even the service of the tabernacle of the congregation. Neither must the children of Israel [non-Levite] henceforth come nigh the tabernacle of the congregation, lest they bear sin, and die.

All the tithe of Israel; only unto the tribe of Levi. Of this tithe the Levites were to tithe 10% to the High Priesthood - Aaron’s descendants who were also of the tribe of Levi. 2Chronicles chapter 31 goes into this, and how the Levites had to prove their bloodline in order to partake of the tithed items. Verses 5-19 outline the fact that the tithe was food items, specifically given only to Levites of ancestral record. Nehemiah 13:10-12 spells this out as well. Leviticus
22:12&13 points out that even a high priest's daughter loses her right to eat of the holy things (tithed items) if she marries outside of the tribe. Leviticus 22:10 says that even a guest at the Levite's home cannot partake of tithed food.

Ezra 2:61-62 tells of some priests who were excluded from temple service (thus their entitlement to tithed food) because he could not document their pure Levite ancestry. Paul reiterates this special position of the Levites in Hebrews 7:5-6; how they alone could receive tithe substance, and what a noteworthy event it was when Melchizedek got a tithe from Abraham.

Even the prophets, those anointed men of YAHWEH, were not known to receive tithe. We might see gifts of food of course, but not money, and certainly not tithe. The Law is very clear: "only unto the tribe of Levi".

**Fact #2 - The tithe was food items only.**

The second fact that defines the tithe is that in every example that we can find, in its original form the tithe was always food items, and based on agricultural increase. Grain, livestock, oil, wine, these are the sort of things that scripture identifies as being tithed.

The tithe of scripture could more accurately be called a "tithe of agricultural increase" because that is precisely what it is. Leviticus 27:30-34 “And all the tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the land, or of the fruit of the tree, is the LORD's: it is holy unto the LORD.

And if a man will at all redeem ought of his tithes, he shall add thereto the fifth part thereof.

And concerning the tithe of the herd, or of the flock, even of whatsoever passeth under the rod, the tenth shall be holy unto the LORD.

He shall not search whether it be good or bad, neither shall he change it: and if he change it at all, then both it and the change thereof shall be holy; it shall not be redeemed.

These are the commandments, which the LORD commanded Moses for the children of Israel in mount Sinai.”

This Law specifies a "tithe of the land" and a "tithe of the herd". We see nothing in God's Law that authorizes a tithe of anything beyond those bounds, and neither have the pro-tithers. Nor does scripture offer any anecdotal example of any tithing taking place outside of the above-mentioned guidelines.
Nehemiah 12:44 specifies “gathering the tithes out of the fields”: “And at that time were some appointed over the chambers for the treasures, for the offerings, for the firstfruits, and for the tithes, to gather into them out of the fields of the cities the portions of the law for the priests and Levites: for Judah rejoiced for the priests and for the Levites that waited.”

See for yourself - if you check a Strong’s concordance for “tithe”, “tithes”, “tithing”, "tenth" or anything similar, it is always in reference to food and animals. In fact, for those who gave cash (obtained only from the direct sale of these food items) instead of the food items themselves, there was a penalty of an additional one-fifth for doing so (Lev 27:31). So 12% is the total due in that case, instead of 10%.

Why the extra 2% in addition to the 10%? I don’t know for sure, but other references to one-fifth in scripture are in regard to a penalty for sin having to do with theft or fraud (Lev 6:5; Numbers 5:7). Whatever the reason, it appears to indicate that a reliable food supply for the Levites was the primary reason for the tithe. Cash was discouraged by adding a one-fifth surcharge and was being accepted only as a second choice.

Let me put it another way:
There has never been any such thing as a Lawful cash “tithe” in Old Covenant scripture.

Read that line again and think about it. It is a Law of God that has been staring us right in the face.

The cash requirement of tithe law is 12% not 10%. Even the pro-tithe crowd will agree with that statement if you press them on the issue, though they ignore it in practice.

Tithe by the very definition of the word is 10%. How do you call a 12% payment (which is the cash requirement) a “tithe”? You can’t, because it is not 10%. It’s like calling 40 ounces a “quart”. Rather, this is a 12% cash payment made instead of the preferred and intended tithe of food items. Cash is a penalty payment of 12% that is made as a substitute for, or more accurately a redemption of a Lawful tithe of food items (Numbers 27:31). The only Lawful tithe by God’s definition has to be food items, not money; The Law is very clear on that.
Let me repeat that, just to be clear: The tithe of scripture is not money. That tithe always consisted of food items. Money is what the Israelites used to buy back their tithe of food items, if for whatever reason (drought, food shortage, etc) they wanted to keep the food that was otherwise designated for the tithe. This in turn incurred a one-fifth surcharge, making the total payment 12% (tithe+2%) instead of the original value of 10% in food items. You will never find a 10% cash tithe mentioned anywhere in the Bible, because it did not exist. A 10% cash tithe is a doctrine of man and a corrupted church, borrowed from ancient pagan cultures. It is not a commandment of God.

Furthermore, anyone who, even in Biblical times did not specifically have an agricultural increase, also did not pay 10% or 12%; they paid nothing because they owed nothing, according to God's Law.

This indicates that if you are a tither, and believe that it is a valid part of God's Law as it applies today, then you are defrauding your preacher of the extra 2% (or by their definition you are “robbing God”) every time you give him a cash tithe instead of food produce or livestock. This produce or livestock must also be something that you or your family have personally raised and had an increase or gain on.

It doesn't make sense to take a tenth of your paycheck from the office to go out and buy food for the purpose of tithing it to your preacher. That is not what the tithe was all about. The tithe of scripture was more or less a sharecropping arrangement – in essence it was a land-use tax for that time on agriculturally productive property.

Those who think they are following God’s Law when they tithe to their preacher, need to read the Law that they think they are following. It says what it says: food only, and for Levites only. Nowhere does scripture contradict or change itself to say that the tithe can be anything else, or that it can go to anyone but the tribe of Levi.

"Those who think they are following God’s Law when they tithe to their preacher, need to read the Law that they think they are following."
The vast majority of people today would have no **lawful** tithe to present at all, even if the true Mosaic tithe were valid today, because they do not participate in any kind of agricultural production. I guess the pro-tithe preachers have not promoted a “12% tithe” because then they would have to explain why there is a difference between 10% and 12%, and that would be getting too close to the truth regarding the tithe as being food-only. For the pro-tithers, that can of worms is best left unopened.

However, the whole issue of **how much** tithe to pay is irrelevant today, because it all assumes that today’s income-tithe has legitimate standing, which it does not.

**A Tithe on All Income?**

The tithe-promoters would have you believe that the tithe is due on **any** income, from whatever source. They defy Scripture, which is very clear when it defines tithe as **food items only**.

Cash in lieu of tithes, as mentioned above, came **only** from the sale of the food items that were supposed to have been tithed in the first place, not from income derived from other sources.

**The Cover Story**

You may hear pro-tithers say that back then everyone was a farmer/rancher type, and that God really wanted cash, but that the people were too dumb to calculate how much money was due. Therefore the tithes were indicated in food items so these primitive **simple folk** could comply more easily.

This is not true at all. First off, it ignores the deliberate distinction made between the produce and cash. The stipulation of a one-fifth surcharge indicates that acquiring food was the primary purpose behind the **food-based** definitions in that Law.

Secondly, there were **lots** of non-agricultural occupations from which income was derived, but tithe law does not include as being tithable. Think about it - weavers, miners, woodcutters, smelters, blacksmiths, carpenters, leather workers, artisans, merchants, stone workers - the list goes on and on. Is there ever a single mention of a tithe of sandals, of cloth, of iron ore, or particularly a tithe of money? (There is in pagan literature, but not in the Christian Bible.)
Yet these occupations and many more provided a means of living at the time, and should have been tithed from if today's tithe-teaching preachers are correct.

Nehemiah 13:31 for example specifically mentions firewood as an "offering" for the temple. Why would they need to have volunteers to cut firewood if they were being tithed 10% of all the wood cut in Israel? If people were supposedly tithing all this cash, why didn't the Levites just use some of the money to buy the firewood?

You may think that a tithe on food production (only) just cannot be - it is unfair to impose an obligation on farmers, ranchers, and vineyards, while everyone else gets off scot free. But God is just; don't forget everyone in Israel had to eat sooner or later. The obligation of the tithe upon those in agriculture would merely increase their overhead, and thus their selling price of food by ten percent. So it would be a hidden tax to everyone else in society who did not produce food items.

So for instance, if half the population of Israel were in agriculture, and they withheld 10% of their production for the Levites, and that cost were spread out over the rest of Israel via higher food costs, that means that by comparison and on average, religious and social structure of Israel was being run on a food budget of 5% from the tithe, not 10%. This is in addition to whatever various offerings and other non-tithe benefits of office the Levites may have received.

In other words, today's tithe-minded preachers want 10% of the entire congregation's total net income from all sources, when the ancient Levites never, - even during those times when Israel was on its best behavior concerning God's Law - never ever received 10% of the across-the-board Israeliite national net profit and increase through the tithe system. If Israel consisted of 75% agriculturalists, then the rate was 7.5%, but it was never a full 10% of national net income because there was always a significant percent of the population that had other types of occupations, who bought their food instead of producing it, and were not subject to tithe.

If a man was a full time blacksmith for example, but raised a garden for family use, then they were expected to tithe on the garden increase only, not
on his smithing income. The tithe was on the amount of food harvested; it had nothing to do with how much of that food was sold.

The tithe had its particular purpose at one time. It was an integral part of the sacrificial system society. It has served its purpose of feeding the Levites back in that era, but is now obsolete.

Today's purported “New Covenant tithe” is what is known as a stolen concept, or anachronistic thinking. That is, taking a concept that is applicable to one situation or time period and misapplying it to another situation that is totally unlike the first. It would be like taking up a collection today to support the widows of Confederate soldiers, or imposing a tax to install a new nation-wide system of telegraph lines and offices. These efforts were appropriate at one time, but obviously not for today.

The Logic of God's Law

If you think about it, in Old Covenant times the tithe made perfect sense. You had one tribe out of twelve that was dedicated to the service of God (Numbers chapter 3 and 1Chronicles 15:2). This group could own homes, but not operate farmland (though they did maintain pastureland to hold the tithed live animals). When eleven tribes each give 10 percent of their produce to the tribe of Levi, it evens out the food supply almost perfectly. The Levites ended up with proportionally 110% as much food as the other tribes had. They in turn tithed 10% of that amount to the high priests. Thus giving Levites an almost an exactly equal share. This afforded them the time to perform their various Temple and administrative duties, rather than deal with issues of raising food. This is precisely what the tithe was originally meant to do.

This tithe as described in the Bible was not instituted to make a few preachers very wealthy, as is the case today; or to create corporate mega-church mon$trosities, or even to build world-wide internet, radio, and television ministries.

The tithe was not even there to build, equip, repair or maintain the temple or any of the utensils used therein. It never has been, even in Old Covenant times.
The tithe was there to feed people; lots of people. Specifically one entire tribe of Israel designated to administer all aspects of the temple, the Law, and the associated society. This included everyone from judges, priests, scribes, and musicians, to the men who hauled out the rumens of sacrificed animals and mopped the temple floors. Not to mention feeding and providing for the families of all these men.

This, by the way, did not include the builders and craftsmen who built or repaired the temple. These were usually non-Levite contractors who volunteered or were hired to do the job with money that was willingly gifted to the project, and had nothing to do with the tithe (2Kings 12:11-12; 2Chronicles 24:11-12).

Think about this: It is almost like taking all of today's Christian clergy, of all denominations, and the choirs and Sunday school teachers and adding all your local, city, county, state, and federal administrative employees and their families to the lot, and supporting all of these people out of your tithe. Imagine the costs involved of supporting basically every twelfth person you would meet on the street. This is what the situation was in the ancient days of Israel.

But these people or their modern day counterparts do not exist in Christian society today. We do not have approximately one out of twelve people in our society to support with a tithe. Instead, we have a relatively few preachers and various clergymen, many with congregations numbering in the hundreds, some in the thousands.

Of this group, we have an even smaller subset of today's preachers that promote a tithe, or a “full tithe”, “Kingdom tithe”, “the Lord's tithe”, “power tithing”, “prosperity tithing” or whatever other feel-good, brand name marketing prefix they want to add to it to make the concept sell with the congregation. These tithe promoters actually expect you to give all this wealth (that far exceeds the food-based tithe that formerly supported nearly a tenth of the population) to them! In other words - much, much more wealth going to far fewer people. Let's get real about this.

In fact I have been told that the Methodists want a five percent tithe, because they say the original tithe was also used to run the government with
(which is not necessarily true) and since their church is not involved with that, they would settle for the half of the tithe that only supported religious activities.

What's not to love about that? Where else can you get in to Heaven for a fifty percent discount? What a deal.

In reality however, we know that half of a fraud is still a fraud.

Similarly, one pro-tithe preacher stated that he knew he did not have the whole tithe coming to him. He said that under the “Israel Kingdom” paradigm that he himself promoted, the tithe is meant to support all government activity (Again, not true. See Chapter 20, The "Kingdom Tax Canard"), with the preachers getting only a tenth of the tithe, like the Aaronite priests of old got.

In short, he admitted that by his own standards of how he understood God’s Law, he really should be getting 1% of the congregation’s income, not 10%, but he is demanding a full tithe from these people anyway. He says he does this, in essence, just so they do not get too lazy or spoiled by paying the lower amount. In other words - “It’s good practice for you, so when the Kingdom does get here you will have been trained in the habit of tithing properly”, or words to that effect.

In an open discussion, I would ask him why doesn’t he just take the 1% that he says is his legitimate share so that he is well practiced in that habit “when the Kingdom gets here”.

Obviously, I disagree with his whole modern tithe premise, but the reason for even mentioning this in the first place is to show how convoluted and inaccurate their information is, and how bold and indifferent they are about admitting and rationalizing their fraud. They demand that the congregation adhere to the strict letter of the Law, while they think nothing of playing fast and loose with the double, triple, and even quadruple standard that the pro tithers vacillate between. In other words they are saying: “Hey, it’s just money, so what’s the harm in giving me ten times more than I believe I really should be getting? You don’t want to be a God robber, do you?”

A Few Specifics

God’s Law may endure forever, and of course He said “I change not, my people change”, but some people do not seem to understand that certain laws
were meant by God to be temporary in order to suit God’s purpose. (Hebrews 9:10)

Specific laws (like the tithe) related to specific people (like the Levites and Aaronites) who performed specific duties for a specified time period (the sacrificial covenant of the Levitical Era).

This entire sacrificial system was specifically made obsolete and superseded (read Hebrews) by a new (Covenant) system.

Therefore it can rightly and reasonably be concluded that the only scripturally defined and lawful tithe-accepting position ever created which was held by the Levite tribe became obsolete the moment that the system that they were specifically an integral part of was made void and defunct. As we know – this all happened about 2000 years ago when the “veil of the temple was rent in two from top to bottom” (Matt 27:51, Mark 15:38, Luke 23:45).

Their contract expired when the New Covenant began; it is as simple as that. (See Hebrews, Chapter 7. Also see "The Big Kibosh" in Chapter 15 "Prophesy Says 'We Still Have Levites' - They’re Us, the Preachers")

The tithe was a special tax used to support the Levites only. Moses, though a Levite did not benefit financially by any tithe, the prophets did not receive tithe; John the Baptist also a Levite (Luke 1:5-13), accepted no tithe that we know of, the Apostles and Jesus had nothing to do with it; but somehow certain preachers brazenly defy scriptures by demanding a right to a tenth of the money that you and your family have worked for.

Pro Church-tithe Technique

There is a pattern of behavior called sophistry that can be identified in pro-tithe preaching:

They will use Bible stories that lend to subjective interpretations, and explain to you what those stories imply or really mean in an arbitrarily pro-tithe manner.

They will habitually use both Old and New Covenant scriptures on offerings and freewill giving as being scriptures about the tithe. Or they will braid together scriptures in order to make the two concepts into one, when scripture routinely and specifically delineates between the tithes, offerings, and other
types of giving. The misuse of 1Chronicles chapter 29 and 2Corinthians chapter 9 are two of many good examples. (See also Chapter 8 "Cain and Abel's Offering, Chapter 13 "Haggai and the Tithe", Chapter 21 "Kinda Similar, Sorta Sounds Like..." for more examples)

They will relate extended and one-sided interpretations of prophecy that go on so long that they often sound more like a filibuster, and tell you how it all means that you must either tithe or be cursed. Even though you or anyone else might never have gotten that impression if you read those prophesies on your own. (Chapter 15 "Prophesy Says 'We Still Have Levites' - They're Us, the Preachers") This is not because of the preacher's superior scriptural understanding, it is instead the result of outcome-based preaching: they first have a desired conclusion, and then design their preaching to arrive at that outcome.

They will use time-tested psychological tactics that play on the exploitable emotions of guilt, greed, and fear, among others, in order to get you to tithe. This includes intensive use of heart-tugging emotional appeals and awe-inspiring rags-to-riches stories of how “having the faith and courage” to tithe made the tither wealthy. Depending on their church doctrine, they may make pie-in-the-sky promises of God's Kingdom here on Earth, if everyone would start to tithe. Of course that last tactic is mitigated by the disclaimer that this Kingdom, as well as the blessings of Malachi 3, may not materialize until all Christians are active tithers. Until then, this provides a perpetual cop-out for those preachers when the pie-mobile never quite arrives and society continues its downhill slide.

They will reverently quote other pro-tithe preacher's opinions, catch phrases, and commentaries as if those preachers had some extraordinary insight, authority, or direct hot-line to God. Then those who quote these opinions of other preachers and authors may then in turn be quoted by still other preachers, particularly if they use a clever turn of a phrase or memorably pithy statement. These can become pyramid schemes of quotes with minimal, if any, scriptural substance at its source.

They will extensively rationalize the tithe with specious reasoning of any sort that they can come up with. I am sure you have heard some of them, such as “You have this rotten, corrupt government because people don’t tithe”; “To deny
the tithe is to affirm slavery”; “Tithing is how you fund God’s morality” (Does God’s morality consist of lies and fraud?); “Would you rather tithe to God, or pay income tax to the government?”, as if one causes the other to disappear; or the incredible “You’re robbing widows and orphans by not tithing”, which as we shall see, is the exact crime that tithe promoters themselves commit according to New Covenant scriptures (See Chapter 26 “True Giving to God”).

Or how about that old bromide: “You’ll tip a waitress 15-20%, but you won’t give God 10%?”

These tactics are commonly used sales pitches; attempted end runs around the scriptural facts as they pertain to the tithe. They appeal to emotion using a false reasoning that comes right out of a “how to sell and get rich” seminar. If you have not already noticed these tactics, start to pay attention to pro-tithe presentations and you will hear rhetoric and techniques like this all the time.

One thing they will not do is they will not go to God’s Law to define the terms of tithing as they would with other subjects, except to then tell you that the Law does not mean what it says.

Nor will they delve into the historical backdrop of the scriptures that they use for pro-tithe purposes. For example the fact that tithing was a common custom for many political and pagan purposes back in Abraham’s time.

Nor will they volunteer to address the many scriptures that support the no-tithe position to give their listeners a balanced view. This type of one-sided teaching is generally known as indoctrination.

Nor will they deal with Jesus’ specific, clearly worded statements in regard to the subject of freewill giving to others (non-preachers), and His specific instructions regarding the limited nature of a preacher’s pay.

Nor will they openly discuss their pro-tithe position with someone reasonably knowledgeable on the subject who can disprove their points.

If they cannot provide direct and clear answers to your questions, this should give you a big clue as to the veracity of their teaching.

Like Hootie, the Radioactive Owl says: "Be wise, and beware". Particularly when it involves the great corruptor - money.
Section Two:

**Old Covenant Scriptures**

used to justify today's income tithe.

There are only a few specific Old Covenant scriptures that are used repeatedly for tithe promoting purposes. You have undoubtedly heard versions of all of them. There are actually only three that even mention *tithe* at all, outside of those scriptures directly connected with the Mosaic/Levitical paradigm. Those three scriptures are:

The story of Abraham (Genesis 14:20) and Jacob’s vow (Genesis 28:22), both occurring long before Levi was born.

The third is Samuel (8:15-18) which, though it occurred during the time that the legitimate Levitical tithe was in existence, is instead referring to a different tithe; one taken by oppressive kings, not by Levites.

Samuel however is regularly ignored or misapplied, because of its anti-modern-tithe significance, and we covered that earlier in this study.

**Pro-tithe theory**

The most prevalent concept used to justify a modern tithe is simply "Because we say so." and the assertion that "This is how it has always been done."

The Law-teaching factions of tithe promoters hinge their theory on the idea that God had Laws for man to live by since Adam. It is claimed that Moses simply put into writing this set of basic Laws of morality, and added to it the establishment of an entirely new sacrificial system. This system included the priesthood, the tabernacle/temple and all of the ritual procedures that went with it: the regulations for sacrifices, penalties for sin, et cetera.

According to the pro-tithers, this group of religious penal ordinances are “that which was added” (Gal 3:17) and later nullified with the New Covenant. All the rest of God’s Old Covenant Laws which applied to daily life of the common
people, such as food laws, agricultural instructions, health and sanitation, for examples, were there right along, and never meant to be changed or abolished.

Tithe promoters claim that a tithe was not part of the new temple/Levitical sacrificial system that Moses established, and therefore not a law that was added and later nullified. Instead they say that today's tithe was part of the Law that existed before the Mosaic Covenant basing their claim on two very short pre-Mosaic scriptures: The story of Abraham and Melchisadek in Genesis 14:20; and the story of Jacob's vow to tithe in Genesis 28:19-22.

These two scriptures involve the word "tithe", and thus provide the only excuse needed to create false conclusions from which an entire doctrine is inflated to the size of a parade-float-sized Snoopy.

Their pro-tithe hypothesis is highly debatable, if they would only allow an honest debate to take place. As with many other historical fallacies, pro-tithe views continue to exist because of intense and widespread repetition of false information, while maintaining a suppression of opposing evidence. Mis-held beliefs like the tithe doctrine (and it is only one of many) can very quickly be discovered when exposed to verifiable facts. We will see how quickly their evidence dissolves as we proceed in examining the pro-tithe arguments.
Chapter 3
Jacob's Vow to Tithe (Gen 28:22)

Genesis 28:22 is a very popular talking point with pro-tithe preachers. They make an *assumption*, but then present it as *fact* that this scripture is one of the proofs of commonplace tithing to God in the days before Moses wrote a tithe into the Law.

This scripture tells us that after an experience with God in a dream, Jacob made a vow to God that he would give ten percent *if* God provided the certain blessings that He said He would. Although God’s unilateral promises and blessings to Jacob also extended to his descendants, there is no indication that Jacob’s personal oath was binding upon those descendants.

The scripture itself, *Genesis 28:20-22*, is very basic: “And Jacob vowed a vow, saying, If God will be with me, and will keep me in this way that I go, and will give me bread to eat, and raiment to put on, So that I come again to my father’s house in peace; then shall the LORD be my God: And this stone, which I have set for a pillar, shall be God’s house: and of all that thou shalt give me I will surely give the tenth unto thee.”

The fact is that Jacob promised to tithe. This story says that Jacob made a vow. A "vow" is defined in Deuteronomy 23:21-23 as an *offering*; something that is not normally required, but *optional*, and only under certain circumstances. This is unlike the compelled tithe described in God’s Law, which was a continual *obligation* on those who had an agricultural increase.

It appears that Jacob made a very conditional and strictly personal obligation. He would tithe only *after* he received the blessings promised. If Jacob’s deal really was a precedent for us to tithe today the way they say it is, at the very least it would totally negate any of these *tithe on faith* (tithing now, to receive prosperity later) promotions that so many preachers use to bait the hook, such as the various *prosperity gospel* promotions.

This category of false ideas also includes the simplistic and anti-Christian "the Kingdom will get here when everyone starts tithing" spiel. It also negates the
preachers' claims that you should not tempt God by waiting for Him to make you prosperous before you tithe on your desired prosperity.

In other words, some of the tithe promoters want you to over-tithe, which is a usurping of God’s Law. In effect they say that if you want to double your income, then double your tithe now, and the double income will eventually get here. The prosperity will come to you if you have faith."

So if that is the case, and faith is the issue, then why do these preachers want their prosperity now (through your over-tithe) instead of waiting until later like everyone else? What, do they have no faith?

According to the "If you do this then I'll do this" basis of Jacob's vow, he had nothing to lose, but that was his deal with God, not ours. It hardly qualifies as a basis for promoting a modern tithe, being a very special situation and a special promise that resulted in Jacob's making of a special offering.

**Jacob's promise = No tithe law.**

Instead of being construed as a pro-tithe scripture, the story of Jacob should more likely serve as an indication to us that there was no common law of the tithe at that time.

First off, “if” means “if”. It's a conditional word that indicates that Jacob would not be doing any tithing if God’s promises were not fulfilled. If they were fulfilled however, then Jacob said he would tithe. This indicates that tithing was not something that he ordinarily did.

If tithing was a Law at that time, then how many other Laws of God do you know of where the person subject to the Law declares to the Lawgiver what the terms of that law will be?

Secondly, since God was doing something special for Jacob by conferring this blessing, you would think Jacob would honor that by doing something special in return, not something ordinary. If tithing was a required common practice at the time as today's income-tithers want you to believe it was, why would Jacob...
make this covenant to do something that he was supposedly already bound to do by God's Law, whether he was singularly blessed or not? That would not make sense. It would be more logical to conclude that Jacob was offering to do something extraordinary, something that would not have normally been expected of him. Something that the surrounding cultures of the time considered to be a means of showing honor and appreciation.

So, though the story of Jacob involved the magic number of 10%, the similarity between that incident and any other tithe in the Bible ended there. It, like Abraham's tithe to Melchizadek, was a one-of-a-kind event, made under unique circumstances.

Although God's blessing and promise to Abraham has much to do with us today, there is nothing to indicate that Jacob's personal, special offer has any modern binding effect, any more than the personal vow of Jephtah (Judges 11:30-40) is a precedent or obligation for all of us today to kill our daughters.

**Semantics**

There are tithe-taking preachers that say Jacob's promise "a tenth of all" is proof not only that a tithe must be paid by Christians today, but also that the tithe must be paid on all sources of income.

Their position violates a basic rule of intelligent comprehension, which is to read things in context. It is apparent that words like all, everyone, always, and never, though absolute in their definition, are often used casually. Usually, as in the case of Jacob, it is obvious that they are confined to the parameters of what was previously discussed.

Without observing the context of Jacob's statement, it could be construed that Jacob would owe God a tenth of the entire universe if "all" is literally taken to mean "all" as the tithe promoters say it does. This is also true in Abraham's case with phrase "tithes of all" (next chapter). The concept of a tenth of the universe is no more absurd than the concept of a tenth of the income of all of Jacob's descendents forever, once the context of the statement has been ignored the way the tithe promoters have done.

Aside from being a demonstration of how the pro-tithers misrepresent what scripture says, I don't know that this point is worth taking up too much more
time, since this was a vow to tithe which by definition was a special contract. The "all" was whatever Jacob had in mind at the time of making the vow; it has nothing to do with us.

**To boil it down:**

- Jacob made a vow to tithe.
- A vow is an offering (Deut 23:21-23).
- An offering such as this (peace offering) is free-will and voluntary (Lev 19:5).
- It is not a tithe in the Levitical sense of it being a required act.
- It would make no sense at all to make a vow to offer something that you were already obligated to pay no matter what, such as a tithe tax.
- Therefore Jacob was offering to do something extra-ordinary.
- There is no Biblical precedent for anyone to be obligated to pay for a vow that someone else has made.

We can very reasonably conclude from the evidence of this passage that there was no known scriptural custom or law requiring anyone to pay tithes on increase to Yahweh God in the days of Jacob, because if there was, Jacob's offer would have been ludicrous.

Remember: God did not tell Jacob to tithe; Jacob offered it. It appears that Jacob intended to do something special to honor God, and he simply borrowed what was a somewhat cosmopolitan custom of the time, and volunteered to God the prospect of a tithe, based on the tradition of the surrounding cultures and the land where he lived.

There is no reason to conclude that we today are obligated to pay a tithe based on Jacob's personal promise made under very extraordinary circumstances.
Chapter 4
Abraham Tithed (Gen 14:20), Therefore So Must We

Of all the pro-tithe arguments, the example of Abraham tithing to Melchizedek is their flagship scripture for a “tithe was and is forever” doctrine. Actually it is more than a flagship, it is practically their whole navy.

I mean, this is the one lone scripture in the pro-tithe line-up that even comes close to being worthy of consideration as evidence. Unlike all the other pro-tithe scriptures that require everything from assumptions, to misapplications, to outright fabrications in order to make their point; this scripture actually does say that Abraham tithed, and that he did so outside of the Levitical/Mosaic Law paradigm.

If not for having this unique scripture to lean on like the keystone of an arch, all their other pro-tithe arguments would collapse into non-existence.

On the other hand, even Genesis 14:20 is weak evidence, and far from being conclusive as pro-modern-tithe proof of anything. This flagship of theirs under closer examination looks more and more like an overinflated life raft.

If this event were detailed with just a little more information that tied it in with the Levitical tithe or a modern tithe, it would have provided a basis for a much more effective and respectable pro-tithe argument; unfortunately it does not.

In fact this scripture is such a brief and thumb-nailed account that it would have almost no significance at all but for two reasons:

First, it is magnified and manipulated by the special attention it gets for its usefulness as a money making scripture. Think about it: If Genesis 14:20 said something non-commercial, like that Abraham greeted Melchizedek with a kiss,
would we be hearing about this scripture repeatedly, with the preacher insisting that we kiss him every time we meet him somewhere? Of course not.

In fact, this is not a hypothetical comparison since Paul gives these very instructions not only in Romans 16:16, but also 1Corinthians 16:20, 2Corinthians 13:12, 1Thessalonians 5:26, and so does Peter in 1Peter 5:14. So ask yourself: Why have you not heard *those* scriptures expounded upon, with threats of God’s curse if you do not “greet each other with a holy kiss”, as often as you have heard the preacher give this same attention to Abraham’s tithe?

I would bet that you have *never* heard Romans 16:16 or the rest of these scriptures taught at all. You have never heard it because *there is no money in it*, even though it is certainly not an unknown or undocumented concept.

The same can be said of many teachings of Jesus himself. He said in John 13:15 “For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.”

Any Christian ought to feel compelled to find out what this example is, so that they might obey it. Am I right? In this case the example is *humility*: Having enough humility, particularly by a leader, to wash the feet of others. An example and instruction followed by *no one* today but a few obscure sects of Christianity.

And why should they? When someone has the arrogance of a Star-bellied Sneetch, they do not engage in “nonsense” like that because their personality type will not allow it. Not to mention once again the standard basis for rejection: *There’s no money in it.* Therefore it is spiritualized away as being some vague, easily forgettable lesson in something-or-other, if it is addressed at all.

The second reason Genesis 14:20 is not lost in the hinterlands of scripture is that its true noteworthiness is elaborated upon in Hebrews 7. The significance has nothing at all to do with legitimizing a modern tithe. We’ll look at Hebrews 7 in Chapter 7 of this book.

The Abrahamic Tithe

The pro-tithe flagship scripture, Genesis 14:16-24 reads: “And he brought back all the goods, and also brought again his brother Lot, and his goods, and the women also, and the people.
And the king of Sodom went out to meet him after his return from the slaughter of Chedorlaomer, and of the kings that were with him, at the valley of Shaveh, which is the king’s dale.

And Melchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God. And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth: And blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And he gave him tithes of all.

And the king of Sodom said unto Abram, Give me the persons, and take the goods to thyself. And Abram said to the king of Sodom, I have lift up mine hand unto the LORD, the most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth, That I will not take from a thread even to a shoelatchet, and that I will not take any thing that is thine, lest thou shouldest say, I have made Abram rich: Save only that which the young men have eaten, and the portion of the men which went with me, Aner, Eshcol, and Mamre; let them take their portion.”

I have been unfairly accused of trying to minimize this passage - of trying to make it seem unimportant. On the contrary I believe it is very important; so important in fact, that I want to enlarge and deconstruct it, examine it, and understand it as much as possible, because it is anomalous to the rest of scripture. It is certainly not at all what the pro-tithers make it out to be.

As usual, the apparent truth of the matter is just the opposite of what the pro-tithers say it is. While they will make maximum pro-tithe use of the first impression that it presents, it is the pro-tithers who then do their best to minimize this scripture by subjecting it to as little examination as possible. They read into it what they wish, and preach accordingly: The most superficial answer - "Abraham paid the tithe, it’s right there in black and white just like Moses told all of us to do; so you should do the same" is what they’ll invariably preach, and that’s that. They treat it like a self-evident, air-tight case simply because it contains the word “tithe”.

“Nothing else for us to see here folks... just move right along and pay your tithe at the door…”

"...this was an exceptional event and that there was much more to it because there was no Levitical tithe-on-increase involved here at all."
However, by reading and understanding this story for what it actually says, we can see that this was an exceptional event and that there was much more to it because there was no Levitical tithe-on-increase involved here at all.

This was a tithe of some type, we cannot argue against that. Hebrews 7 makes that clear and treats this event as being very significant; but not for any purposes of establishing the practice of a modern tithe.

The questions that we really need to ask are:
• What kind of tithe was it?
• Does this event have any relevance whatsoever as a reason to support today's commercial church tithe industry?

First off, we need to keep in mind the established fact that tithes of various types and reasons were not uncommon at that time in history. Furthermore, we know that this event was not a Mosaic/Levitical type tithe for four obvious reasons:
• There were no Levites at the time of Abraham, as stipulated in tithe law.
• This tithe included things other than food items, another tithe law requirement.
• The story depicts a historically notable and special one-of-a-kind event.
• Abraham had no gain or increase at all from this victory. An increase is also a pre-requisite for tithing, by Mosaic/Levitical standards.

All four of these characteristics contradict Old Covenant Law. Yet the pro-tithers promote the impossible position that Abraham's tithe was indeed an example of a typical pre-Levitical, Levitical tithe, and that it thus somehow defines for us today's presumed post-Levitical, Levitical New Covenant tithe. This modern church tithe has next to nothing in common with either the Levitical or Abrahamic tithes.

Because of the brevity of the account, we are working with only sketchy information regarding this story, but a sketch can still be a pretty good picture. If we rule out the impossible (applying the Mosaic tithe paradigm to Abraham's actions) we can then search for the most probable explanation of the event.

To start with, I think we can all agree on the first two bullet points: there were no Levites at that time, since Levi was not even born until years later, and
the second point that there were more than just food items tithed, is obvious from the reading the whole chapter itself.

I said earlier that “whenever you see the word ‘tithe’ relating to the Levites, it has to be relating to food, because if it were money they would have used a different word instead of ‘tithe’ for it.” Well, in this example Abraham gave a tenth of the spoils that apparently included things other than food, and may have included money, but it was still only ten percent. This fact alone indicates that it was more closely related to the worldly tithes of that day, than to anything else.

Regarding the other two bullet points - Nowhere does it say that Abraham ever gave anyone ten percent of his increase on a regular basis. In fact when Hebrews 7:4 refers back to this account, the purpose is not to set a New Covenant tithe precedent as tithe promoters claim. Instead it was written to impress upon the Abrahamic/Mosaic-oriented original readers of Hebrews just how great Jesus is by juxtaposing Him with the only other known Melchizedek priest with whom these readers might have been familiar. The issue of a tithe was simply the means to the end of proving that point.

Hebrews 7 and Genesis 14 portray this one particular incident as a special occasion - a unique event.

Hebrews talks about Melchizedek "To whom a tenth Abraham gave out of the choicest spoils". Notice that it mentions nothing like "To whom he yearly gave a tenth of his harvest" or anything along those lines. It only describes the gift made from the spoils during this one particular incident. Abraham's offering to Melchizedek was technically a tithe, because it was 10%, but that is where the similarity to any other scriptural tithe ends.

This appears to have been a one-time gift, and not a regular tithe within the same definition as the Levitical tithes. The only connection is that they were both 10%, which is not that terribly significant considering the historical backdrop of the widespread use of tithes by other cultures in that part of the world at that time.
A Tithe with No Increase

The fourth reason I say it was not a Levitical type tithe is because Abraham gained nothing from his victory. Not a dime - nothing that did not belong to him or his kin, or his allies in the first place. He simply recovered people and things that were stolen, and he clearly did not accept the King of Sodom's reward offer.

Abraham set off to rescue Lot and his family, but ended up recovering the whole shebang which included the people and property of Bera, the Sodomite king. Abraham could have easily left the people and property where they were, as he obviously did not want to own any of it, while he brought back only Lot's family and possessions.

If Abraham was living by a morality that was similar to that which was later written into God's Law, then he was at that point pretty much expected to return these things according to the premise of Exodus 23:4-5:

“If thou meet thine enemy’s ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again. If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, and wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help with him.”

So we can see that Abraham did not have to be on good terms with Bera or his friends in order for him to feel obligated to return the captured people and property to them.

If a Levitical tithe is on an increase (which the Law states it is by its very definition), then Abraham's offering does not qualify as a “tithe” as we know it, because he had no increase from which to tithe. It is a tithe of some kind, clearly, but the nature and characteristics of this tithe are not explained in scripture like the Levitical tithe is.

It appears from the context of the story that Abraham purposed in his heart to return all recovered goods to these kings anyway, and this seems to be the understanding that he had with them, so he was actually making the tithe/gift to Melchizedek with what entrepreneurs call OPM - Other People's Money.

I did a little word study that I found interesting. In the King James Bible Hebrews 7:2 says “To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all;” which is almost always preached to mean “of all the property”, with the assumption that this
property somehow belonged to Abraham. The Greek Interlinear Bible however, states “to whom a tenth part from all divided Abraham”. That’s quite a big difference.

This led me to examine the original Greek words used in this verse, and “from” is a more accurate translation of #575 than “of” is, because it has the connotation of a separation taking place. Without getting too detailed, I’ll sum it up to say that Hebrews 7:2 can easily and very reasonably be read as “Abraham separated a tenth of everyone’s possessions from them”.

Adding more weight to this interpretation is the fact that Hebrews 7:4 says “Now consider how great this man was, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils.”

The “of” in “of the spoils” is #1537. This word means in effect “out of” or “as a portion of” and has a much different meaning than #575 does in verse 7:2.

If “To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all;” meant “a tenth part of all the property” as pro-tithers say it does, then it most likely would have used #1537, just like it did in verse 7:4 where it says “unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils.”

This may all sound like hair-splitting, but it is really not. If this scripture in fact originally meant that “Abraham divided from everyone a tenth of their property for the purpose of gift-tithing it to Melchizedek” as opposed to the establishment pro-tithe theory that “Abraham tithed on all of his newfound personal prosperity,” it would further underscore the already-apparent uniqueness if this event. In essence it is one person tithing to a second person the property of several third persons.

This updated translation does make more sense in light of the fact that we know from the scriptural context that Abraham did not consider any of this property as belonging to him at any time.

In any event, where in God’s Law does it say you can tithe property that belongs to someone else? It does not. So that is another anomaly which makes the pro-tithe application of “pre-Levitical tithe” theory to this event an impossibility. This also indicates that Abraham was working with some other, unknown tithe protocol.
Who is the thief? Who is the Liar?

Was Abraham a “thief”, as one tithe promoter emphatically stated had to be the case, for tithing property that belonged to others?

That type of sensational statement (calling Abraham a thief) is a manipulative device used by professional speakers that plays on emotions, and is no substitute for facts or reason. This is some of the “yellow preaching” that I defined earlier. It implies a limited false choice: (Either Abraham was a thief, or he gave a Levitical type tithe), and this is a manipulative trick that should be identified.

A third and more obvious option is that there is plenty of reason to assume that Abraham had the king of Sodom’s (Bera’s) consent for this gift (It looks like this king was the only one present of the allied kings, apparently representing the others), but the fact remains that none of this tithed property belonged to Abraham at any time.

After all, those kings just got their clock cleaned, were lucky to be alive, and had pretty much kissed their people and property good-bye. So you can imagine their joy and relief with word from Abraham to meet him and get their stuff.

Melchizedek was speaking to Abraham who was the man of the hour, and Abraham did the honor of presenting the tithes to him as a tribute. What is wrong with that? That does not make Abraham a “thief”.

Abraham had possession of it but did not own it, and Bera did not seem to care one way or the other about the property, he just wanted his people back. So, why not honor Melchizedek as a condition of returning everything to the original owners? It made an impressive gift and was quite a significant gesture.

The real question here is: Why did this tithe take place at all? Was it to honor Melchizedek as king? Or to submit to him as the only true priest of God until the messiah arrived? Hebrews Chapter 7 (also Chapter 7 of this book) holds the key to that answer.

The Pro-tithe “Rules of Possession”

The tithe-promoting preacher tried to make the following case as to how this all must have transpired:
According to the pro-tithe premise, Abraham owned all of this spoil recovered in battle. In order to believe that, the following must also be accepted: If you steal you are a sinner, but if you steal as a large enough group, or gang, or if a government steals by using its military force, that is all kosher. By doing so they now own the stolen property fair and square according to what that pro-tithe preacher calls some undefined "rules of war". This might makes right principle of his says that the victorious army now rightfully owned the property and slaves that they stole, simply because it was done by orders of a political leader like a king. By taking this position, that preacher in effect has elevated government entities to a status that is above God's Law, because God's Law de-legitimizes ownership of anything obtained via theft.

According to this pro-tithe theory, the Assyrians rightfully owned what they had taken by force. If Abraham could steal this property back from the new owners, then Abraham would be the new "rightful owner".

The pro-tithe preacher goes on to say that the only way that Abraham could not be a "thief", (even though he, in theory, just stole it back from the supposedly then-rightful owners) would be that, from the time Abraham recovered the goods and people, to the time he tithed it to Melchizedek, Abraham actually owned this property and actually had an increase that he was obliged to tithe from. Since these were spoils of war, (how can a private citizen like Abraham declare a "war"?) Abraham momentarily owned them fair and square, and immediately tithed from them. Or so this pro-tithe interpretation of the story goes.

According to that preacher, this proved that, not only was the law of the tithe on increase in effect since the beginning (pre-Mosaic), but that this story also proved that the tithe is on all income, from any source, not just agricultural.

I have not heard other pro-tithe preachers go into fantastic explanations like this as to why Abraham owned this property, even though Abraham himself never considered it as belonging to him. They do, however, promote the false assumption that Abraham did indeed own it.

Unfortunately for them, even the best preachercraft cannot make this strange scenario and bizarre conclusion work as being a plausible explanation. This
temporary ownership hypothesis has some obvious fatal flaws, beside what I have already explained above.

First, Abraham recovered the stolen property for the defeated kings (of Sodom, etc), not from them. So Abraham never owned anything after this battle that he did not already own before the battle took place, and this amounted to exactly nothing. Abraham did not personally lose anything to these plunderers, and he did not personally gain anything with their defeat. He simply set out to rescue his nephew Lot with his family and possessions, and ended up retrieving the kings' property as well.

Again, here is Exodus 23:4-5 “If thou meet thine enemy’s ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again. If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lying under his burden, and wouldest forbear to help him, thou shalt surely help with him.”

Imagine this analogy - You chase down someone who just snatched a family member’s purse. You scuffle with the thief, and are successful in recovering not only the purse for the owner, but several wallets belonging to third party strangers. Do the wallets now belong to you? Does the purse and its contents now belong to you, or are you instead a temporary custodian of all this property until it is returned to the rightful owners? Would you now owe a tithe on what the wallets, and the purse and contents were worth, before you gave it back to the people that it all belonged to? It would be absurd to think so, but that is exactly the pro tithe position on the issue.

It is precisely the same kind of situation we have here in Genesis 14, and it is just as absurd to claim that Abraham now owned the property that he recovered for his nephew or for the kings; property that Abraham never claimed ownership of.

That is the nature of a family - to protect each other, and each other's property. It is not a “finders keepers” situation. Even if words like prey or spoils are used, in this case it just means something taken by force. It does not necessarily mean that the one who took it now rightfully owns it.

"Obviously, in the mind of Abraham, and all involved, the ownership of this property rightfully belonged to these other individuals right along."
Due to the context of the story, it is clear that ownership was not a debatable issue, and that this tithe took place for reasons totally independent of any alleged but non-existent gain on the part of the tither, Abraham. That is also the nature of class and integrity—you do not prosper on someone else’s misfortune, as is so common today. Abraham only claimed part of the expenses, which was the food that his people ate while they returned. He did not take advantage of the situation to enrich himself in any way. This is very characteristic of Yahweh God's prophets, Apostles, and His true workers on Earth.

The second evident flaw in the pro-tithe “Abraham owned it” reasoning is this: What right would Bera have to tell Abraham words to the effect of: "you go ahead and keep all the stuff, and I'll keep the people" if Abraham already owned all of it? This does not make sense. Would this pro-tithe preacher, after he had been beaten at poker, then tell the winner with the pile of money “I'll let you keep all the quarters, and I'll take the nickels and dimes”? He might try it, but he would only be making a fool of himself and get his hand slapped. It is the owner of the property that has the authority to make a determination as to what to do with it, not the loser of the property. In this case Bera was making the determination (or offer), not Abraham, because the king’s ownership of it was apparently restored right from the moment that Abraham recovered it from the plunderers, and it seems that everyone involved understood this.

Abraham also stated that he would not let the King of Sodom "make him rich" with a reward. How in the world could this king do so if he would be giving Abraham a gift of things that Abraham supposedly already owned via these alleged rules of war according to the pro-tithe yarn? Obviously, in the mind of Abraham, and all involved, the ownership of this property rightfully belonged to these other individuals right along, and Abraham clearly identifies the recovered items as belonging to Bera in Genesis 14:23. Abraham knew this property did not belong to him, Bera knew it, I know it, and now you know it. Everyone seems to know the obvious fact that Abraham claimed nothing for himself, except the pro-tithers themselves who, by necessity of their invalid doctrine, must assert that it was his personal tithable gain.
Any attempt by tithe promoters to wrangle these scriptures into saying that Abraham actually took ownership of the recovered items, and considered it all a so-called *increase* to tithe from, is nonsense and a total prevarication.

Based on this pro-tithe preacher’s “finders-keepers” attitude about situations like this, I would hate to be the person who lost a wallet in this guy’s church parking lot. Good luck in ever getting it back, as he obviously equates possession with ownership in cases like this.

To subscribe to the pro-tithe position on this issue and follow through with it, you would have to agree that:

- Abraham paid a tithe for his brief possession of the property because it was an “increase”,
- Then when he returned 90% of everything to Lot and the kings, they had to pay *another* tithe on the same property because they now momentarily possessed it as an “increase” before returning 81% of it to the individuals in their group who originally owned it,
- Then, the original owners would have to pay yet *another* tithe on this "increase" of the return of 81% of things they owned to begin with. In other words they are tithing 8.1% on property that represents a 19% loss of what they originally owned before they were robbed.

Only a tithe-preacher or a government tax attorney could come up with something as irrational as this. But that would truly be the end result of the pro-tithe teaching if you take the preacher's position and carry it through to its logical end.

If you think this pro-tithe theory makes sense, go for it. I believe it is an absurd conclusion, but it is made because they *have* to make it. They have to make up something, *anything* to obscure the facts of this scripture. It shows the desperate lengths they will go to, to make their tithe doctrine work.

An example of *God-Ordained non-tithing* on increase
I will further prove my point. If Abraham paid a typical tithe on increase as the pro-tithers said he did, then for scripture to be consistent we would see other similar situations handled the same way, would we not?

Let’s go to Numbers 31:27-30. It is fairly self-explanatory, but I will summarize: We have here a detailed story of a tremendous military victory for Israel, very similar to Abraham’s situation, only this time it was God ordained retribution against the Midianites, not a personal decision to engage in conflict. This tremendous gain in material goods made by Israel was legitimized by God’s instructions. So it was not a theft as nearly all other war plunderings in history are, and it was not a recovery of property as was the case with Abraham. It was an actual massive haul of an increase that they got to keep after killing the original owners, and there were lots of spoils to divide up.

So does God instruct Moses to set aside ten percent, as the pro-tithe theory would demand? No, not at all.

God instructed them to divide the spoils in half; to give one half to those who actually participated in the battle, and one half to everyone else in Israel. Then the soldiers were to give 1/500th of their take (that’s .2% of what you’d call earned income) and give it to the priests, and the rest of Israel was to do the same with 1/50th of their take (2% of unearned income), giving it to the Levites. That’s 10 times more for the Levites, because there were many more Levites than there were priests.

These are clearly worded instructions right from the mouth of God on how to handle a windfall situation. It is not conjecture, not extrapolation, not my opinion, but very plain statements of instruction.

If every word of Scripture is an example unto us and profitable for learning (2Timothy 3:16), why have you not heard the example of Numbers 31:27-30 discussed in a professionally presented Bible study?

If Abraham was following a law, as the speculators say, or even just setting an example for others to follow, why were God’s instructions in Numbers 31 so extremely different, even though the situations were nearly identical regarding miraculous victory and lots of spoils?

"Maybe a pro-tithe, Law-teaching preacher needs to explain the correct tithe law to God, since Yahweh God’s instructions don't fit the current preacher-created tithe doctrine at all."
Why did the Levites not get a straight 10% instead of getting only 2%? Maybe a pro-tithe, Law-teaching preacher needs to explain the correct tithe law to God, since Yahweh’s instructions do not fit the current preacher-created tithe doctrine at all.

When asked about this scripture, all one preacher could say in his CD presentation was that these were “special instructions” specific to them for that particular victory, and not of any concern for us today.

Oh, really? And Abraham’s victory and meeting with Melchizedek was not a special situation as well? Again, these arrogant “Law-teachers” have no compunction about negating the intent of God’s Word with a simple off-the-cuff comment whenever it profits them to do so.

In 1Samuel 30:26-30 it appears that David followed a similar example of wealth distribution after his men smote and looted the Amalekites.

David spread the wealth around as gifts to a detailed list of many, many people, but there is no mention there of any tithe. Why? You would think that there would be at least a quick mention of it, if it was an example of the thing to do.

The answer to all of the above is this: Because these spoils were not an agricultural increase, which would have been tithable in that era under Mosaic Law; but instead was the product and result of battle, which, among many other increase-producing occupations, was never subject to a tithe under God’s Law.

Speaking of windfalls and sudden prosperity, FYI - What about Job? Job is on record for his many sacrifices, but not as ever having tithed; either during his pre-calamity prosperity or in his second, post-illness prosperity. There is no mention at all of a tithe to anyone by this iconic example of righteousness.

The first thing a pro-tithe preacher would have asked Job at his bedside would be “Have you been tithing to avoid misfortune, like you’re supposed to?” Of course no one in the Book of Job even mentions the tithe because it was apparently not a normally expected activity during Job’s time.

If the victory spoils in Numbers 31, very similar to Abraham’s, was not tithable under God’s Law, along with the implications of any other analogous
case in scripture, we have to conclude that Abraham's situation was not tithable either by any standard of known tithe law; Particularly since he had no gain, while the Israelites of Numbers 31 had a great gain.

So then what was the tithe to Melchizedek all about? How is it that Abraham presented a tithe when he had no increase, while the Israelites paid no tithe for a great increase? There's more to that story, and some answers in Chapter 7 which examines Hebrews Chapter 7.
Chapter 5
Pretentious Precedents and Made Up Models

As I mentioned earlier, the “One-Two Punch” is the fact of God’s Law in that it limits the tithe to being from food sources only, and was to be given to Levites only.

What do the pro-tithe preachers say about these scriptures? Most say as little as possible; or they ignore the fact of this issue altogether. Others may simply apply these scriptures as if they authorize a modern tithe, without bothering to explain how “food only, specifically for the Levites” magically transformed itself into “cash from all income to the church corporation”.

In order to avoid dealing with what God’s Law has to say about the tithe, one pro-tithe preacher made a creative attempt to address the “one-two punch” by inventing the twin doctrines that he calls the “Abrahamic Covenant Precedent” and the “Melchizedek Model”.

This man claims to be an “evangelist and Law teacher” as well as a strict pro-nomian in regard to the Law of Moses. He regularly claims that he “loves God’s Law”, but he did an about-face after reading the first draft of my position. He now says he is not really concerned with that old Mosaic Law Covenant anyway (from and about which he’s been preaching for years). Suddenly that law is all apparently irrelevant; particularly regarding the tithe.

That is quite an odd response, even by tithe-supporting standards. Many of the scriptures they use in preaching the tithe, including Malachi, are based on Mosaic Law scriptures, but now he is willing to throw that all under the bus in order to side-step the “one-two punch” scriptures that I have just presented and that he has no answer for. He has no answer for it because there is no answer for it - the Law says what it says, and it says it clearly.
Rather than face the facts of God's Law, the suddenly anti-Mosaic preacher jumped ship from the defined terms of God's written Law to the less defined narrative story in Genesis of Abraham. He has hitched his tithe wagon to what he has given the scholarly sounding moniker of “The Abrahamic Covenant Precedent” which that preacher now claims to be the real source for tithe authority (not to be confused with the legitimate and well known Abrahamic Covenant).

The gist of this maneuver is that Abraham tithed before the Levites existed, so it does not matter what that musty Old Covenant Law says. Instead, it is the “Abrahamic Precedent” that we need to pay attention to, not the tithe law of Moses. Basically we are looking at an attempted end-run around God's Law by someone who otherwise claims to teach that Law faithfully.

Technically Abraham's presentation to Melchizedek is a tithe. Therefore it is fair game for the tithe promoters to make all kinds of hay with if they can keep us from looking at it too closely. This is not a tithe with any direct relevance to the Levitical tithe, but this particular tithe promoter says that is OK. According to him it is the tithe to Melchizedek that is the real thing - the standard that we are supposed to follow, and it is the Levitical tithe that we suddenly find is unimportant.

I could not find “Abrahamic Covenant Precedent” in a web search, so I am thinking that this preacher created this term one morning while brushing his teeth, as some kind of pretentious academic title, to give his flawed, made-up idea the guise of an established concept, rather than admit to what it really is: a flawed, made-up idea.

It is apparent and understandable that the pro-tithers would want to latch onto a great figure like Abraham and try to ride his robe-tails by associating their false doctrine with him. The intent seems to be to take the established, legitimately recognized Abrahamic Covenant and then associate it with a bogus but similarly sounding false doctrine called “The Abramic Covenant Precedent”.

"...so I'm thinking that this preacher created this term as some kind of pretentious academic title, to give his flawed, made-up idea the guise of an established concept, rather than admit to what it really is: a flawed, made-up idea."
This is a deceptive name-game just like the Federal Reserve which is not federal, nor is it a reserve, but it sure sounds good, doesn’t it?

Having listened to these preachers for decades, I have never heard of two different God-ordained tithe paradigms, the Levitical and the pre-Levitical, until recently discovering it for myself. Now that the cat is out of the bag, the pro-tithe damage control department has to come up with something, anything to neutralize and obfuscate the fact that the nature of Abraham’s tithe was nothing like the Levitical tithe.

Thus, the “Abrahamic Covenant Precedent” is born. They can not dispute the fact of two very different tithes, so instead they go with the inevitable flow of newly found facts and temporarily play along with it; manipulating the information the best they can in order to salvage some of their lost credibility.

So, the pro-tithers abruptly contradict themselves as well as contradicting the theoretically continuous, monolithic Law of God that supposedly existed from Adam up to today that some of us have heard so much about. Instead of the ever present, one and only, no-fooling-around "law of the tithe" doctrine that has saturated the minds of some congregations, we are suddenly introduced to the stopgap doctrine of "Tithe A" and "Tithe B".

A new doctrine suddenly emerges that allows for a mysterious different tithe with an occult origin and basis; one that is somehow the same as the Mosaic tithe while being totally different; yet supposedly it is a tithe that now supersedes the known Mosaic Law tithe. A tithe called the “Abrahamic Precedent”.

If that preacher has bailed out on the Mosaic Covenant Law in favor of this Abrahamic thing, then here is a question for you: Where are the details and terms of the governing law of the “Abrahamic Covenant Precedent”, so we can learn them and apply them to our lives? What are all those laws that Abraham followed that exempts this preacher from addressing the Law of Moses and the words of Jesus?

The answer is basically “Whatever the preacher can find or make up, and convince you of.” Since we have no codified itemized terms of conduct for the

"In truth, this tithe is not an “Abrahamic precedent” for anything. That is because it was done under conditions and in a situation that has never been seen since, and not likely to occur in the future."
**Abrahamic Covenant Precedent** the way we do for the Mosaic Covenant which defines God’s Laws and His morality, we are in uncharted territory and this man can invent whatever he thinks he can get away with, claiming that it supersedes what Moses wrote. For example the invented tale of Cain’s “first fruit tithe” (see below under “First Fruits Free for the Taking).

On the other hand, if this newly-minted "Abrahamic Precedent" is not meant to alter anything other than the tithe-related parts of God’s Law, the same question applies: Where are the rules that define the actions that are taking place in the story of Abraham?

You see, God’s Law and the Mosaic Covenant are pretty clearly written, and the “one-two punch” in particular can hardly be disputed. The story of Abraham on the other hand is in the form of a narrative which can easily be manipulated and have ideas read into it as to “why this happened” or “what Abraham was thinking when that happened”. The preacher can steer a trusting audience any way he wants to.

Trying to delve deeper into Bible stories like this is fine if it is based on scriptural or other reliable evidence to prove the conclusions or expand Biblical understanding. But as Paul warned us, there are preachers who use such opportunities to invent their own doctrines, and we need to keep them in line by pressing the buzzer every time they start fictionalizing the truth to fit their own self interest. After all, in this case we’re dealing with one single sentence, upon which they have built their doctrine - Gen 14:20 “And blessed be the most high God, which hath delivered thine enemies into thy hand. And he gave him tithes of all.”

In truth, this tithe is not an “Abrahamic precedent” for anything. That is because it was done under conditions and in a situation that has never been seen since, and not likely to occur in the future.

In this case, scripture gives us a significant, once-in-history event that involves one great historical figure doing homage in the symbolically significant form of a tithe, to another greater historical figure. The pro-tithe preacher takes that scripture and applies the cheapest, most unexamined view while propagating the most extreme, unwarranted conclusion from it.

Once all the self-contradicting preaching has settled, at the end of the day the song will be the same, and the lyrics of the tune will be “everyone should
tithe on everything they get, and give it to the preacher, because Abraham tithed to Melchizedek”.

This is all done in the face of the fact that the story indicates that Abraham gained nothing at that time for him to tithe on, that this was a unique significant event, and that the mysterious Melchizedek had the highest “Biblical rank” in scripture second only to Jesus Christ Himself. This preacher then calls his half-baked loaf of intellectual Wonderbread “The Abrahamic Covenant Precedent” to impress his listeners.

Anyone who gives this “Abrahamic Covenant Precedent” nonsense any credence whatsoever should also consider the alternative conclusion to the one promoted by that preacher. The alternative being that a more literally accurate "precedent" created by Abraham would be this:

- We should tithe directly to Melchizedek, and only to Melchizedek.
- We should tithe only when God causes us and 318 compatriots to destroy an army of 800,000 men, or 80,000, or perhaps even 8,000.
- We should tithe only when Melchizedek blesses us and gives us bread and wine.

Is this not a correct observation of the “precedent” that Abraham set, if any? Is this conclusion any more ridiculous, partisan or extreme than the pro-tithe interpretation is?

I mean, if they want to play self-serving baby games with words in order to justify a doctrine, anyone else can do so as well just to show how silly their rationalizations are; whether or not they have a fancy name for it.

The relevance of the Mosaic Law

Before we toss aside the bona-fide Law of God and adopt this preacher's tithe-friendly "Abrahamic Precedent" doctrine, let us read what Jesus had to say in John 5:45-47 “Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?”

In other words - Old and New Covenants fit together to form the big picture. Jesus did not mention an interaction with Melchizedek as being any kind of precedent, instead He identified the Mosaic Law as being the authoritative
influence. You do not fully understand the teachings of Jesus if you brush aside the writings of Moses. This pro-tithe preacher is arbitrarily tossing out the writings of Moses that he does not like with this “Abrahamic Covenant Precedent” puffery, even though Abraham himself endorsed the Law and teachings of Moses in Luke 16:29-31.

Jesus said to the Pharisees in John 7:19 “Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keepeth the law?"

They only kept parts of the Law, just like this man is doing. So who should we believe - Abraham as told by Jesus, or the overblown arguments and pretentious precedents of self-contradicting preachers?

I mean, let’s put this all in perspective. Can you refuse to help your neighbor who is dying on your doorstep, and then hide behind a moral defense of the “Noahistic Defense Precedent” that you just made up? No, of course not. When Noah refused those who were pleading to get into the ark, that was not a precedent for us because it was a unique event in history, just as Abraham’s tithe was.

In this case, the preacher gives lip service to “loving God’s Law”, but then proceeds to do his best to negate that Law the minute it gets in the way of his financial interest vis-à-vis the tithe doctrine.

"...the “Melchizedek Model”, a term of equal academic-sounding flashiness, but also apparently unheard of until this pro-tithe preacher invented it to lend credulity to his tale."

"The “Melchizedek Model”"

The joined-at-the-hip sister of the brainy-sounding “Abrahamic Covenant Precedent” is the “Melchizedek Model”, a term of equal academic-sounding flashiness, which also leeches its assumed credibility by using the name of a prominent scriptural figure. It apparently was unheard of until this pro-tithe preacher invented it to lend credulity to his tale.

This “model” states that since Jesus is a priest of the order of Melchisadek, and since Abraham tithed to the first Melchisadek, then we should be tithing to the preachers. Yes, 2 plus 2 equals 17. Apples equal oranges. It is the same slanted thought process as the previous pro-tithe creation.

Aside from the obvious self-interested, anacronistic conclusion of their logic, this theory of theirs brings us to the question of “What are the principles and
rules for living under a Melchizedek Priesthood, as opposed to living under God's Law as written by Moses?” We do not see those available to us in this short story any more than we see the rules for living under an “Abrahamic Precedent”.

What we see is an event. If this event reflected precepts written in God’s Law, we would then use it as an example for us to take note of. It is a vaguely described event that, while not breaking the Law of God, is certainly anomalous to that Law. Preachers take advantage of this vagueness by adding their own smoke and mirrors; avoiding the facts by filling in the gaps with the most lucrative commentary possible.

The rules of conduct under the first Melchizedek Priesthood are unavailable to us. He appears in scripture for that moment in history, and then disappears again. There is a passing reference to him in Psalms, and then he is the subject of Hebrews chapter 7 which gives us the most information about him. There is not anything to be found on him in history books, and commentaries on him are either speculation, or reiterations of what scripture already tells us.

Even if there were some indications of what Melchizedek was all about, there is nothing that says that the rules in the first Melchizedek era were exactly the same as they are in the second Melchizedek era that we are in now. So it behooves us to pay close attention to the words of the one and only, currently abiding Melchizedek Priest that we have any detailed knowledge of, and that is Jesus Christ, our one and only true Melchizedek model.

If I said it once, I said it a hundred times - the words of Jesus and the narratives of His example take priority over everything else in scripture. If He is the one High Priest, then He is a living example that we should be emulating as being the sum of God’s morality from the time of Genesis through to today. I think Christ knew and understood God’s Law and God’s will just a little bit better than the tithe-taking preachers do. There are many fundamental conflicts between the pro-tithe preacher’s teachings and the instructions of Jesus. We will certainly cover some of them in the New Covenant section of this book.

The emphasis that tithe-takers place on this notion of Abraham’s tithe, and particularly on this “Melchizedek Model” is just a red herring; a false issue used for psychological more than factual purposes. It is no more conclusive or binding
upon us than the fact that the Israelites once tithed to their Levite kinsmen. The New Covenant has some new rules, which makes some of the old rules old, and tithing, as we shall see, is one of them that Hebrews 8:13 talks about when it says “Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.”

Strangely, after the audience forgot what the question was, this pro-tithe preacher flip-flops back and proceeds along, with claims of his (the pro-tithe preacher’s) Levites’ birthright of accepting tithe. So now, the Levites become relevant again as it suits the pro-tithe purpose, and the “Abrahamic Covenant Precedent” and “Melchizedek Model” quickly become half-forgotten footnotes in tithe propaganda.

The Changing, Unchanging Law
These are just a few of the problems and inconsistencies that we run into when we examine a man-made law (of a modern tithe) that is palmed off by preachers as being God’s Word, and which is in contradiction to so many plain and understandable scriptures that indicate otherwise. This sets the stage for a multitude of fallacies and self-contradictions that become necessary in order for pro-tithe preachers to prosper; and it necessarily makes deception the bedrock of this false doctrine.

To quote this same pro-tithe preacher: “Any tithe preached that is not Lawful is not Biblical.” Yet with astounding hypocrisy he and others promote a modern tithe that is very unlike either the Lawful scriptural tithe, or Abraham’s tithe. The only definitive Law that we have is the Mosaic Law, and this preacher has selectively disavowed that in an attempt to make his tithe doctrine appear to be viable.

Theories without substance that are given pretentious titles like “Abrahamic Precedent” and “Melchizedek Model” are simply marketing ploys. They are distractions from the facts, and they embody the manipulative psychological techniques of false teachers that the Apostles Peter and Paul emphatically warned us to steer clear of.
Chapter 6
Abraham the Law Keeper "Paid the Tithe"

As an offshoot of the Abraham/Melchizedek tithe event, tithe promoters point to Genesis 26:5 - "Because Abraham obeyed Me and kept My charge, My commandments, My statutes and My laws." They then imagine that Abraham tithed regularly and preach this fantasy as fact, then inevitably concluding: “therefore you should too”.

Again, they resort to name-dropping in order to achieve a fake endorsement from Abraham for the modern tithe.

This is an example of one of those presuppositions that pro-tithers rely on to make their case. Since God had some type of laws of conduct at the time of Abraham, pro-tithers claim that this automatically is proof that a tithe law, as documented by Moses generations later, existed from the beginning and was practiced by Abraham. We just saw however, that if Abraham was following some kind of Divine law, that law is unknown to us today because his tithe was totally different from that instructed in the Mosaic Law.

An honest assessment leads to the fact that, like it or not, Abraham was simply following the trend of the local culture when he tithed to Melchizedek, in order to honor him at that particular place and time.

I find it interesting that in Genesis Chapter One through Twenty, there is no mention of God's Law at all, let alone statutes. The only commandments that seem to exist are God's personal instructions; for example to Adam, Noah and Abraham.

The closest thing I see to any "Law-keeping" is in Genesis 18:19 “For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way
of the LORD, to do justice and judgment; that the LORD may bring upon Abraham that which he hath spoken of him."

"Justice and judgement" require some kind of moral standards to go by, so I am not saying that there was no Law at that time, I am just saying that we are not given any specifics about what it was and how it compared to the Law as written by Moses, since there apparently were differences.

If you want statements about a pre-Mosaic law in Abraham's time, I would refer you to a few of the Apostle Paul's writings:

- Romans 4:1-5 Says the blessings and promises made to Abraham were based on his faith, not Law-keeping.
- Romans 4:13-17 says that Law-keeping is irrelevant at best, and if too much emphasis is placed on it, it negates the salvation that would have come through faith. This is confirmed in Galatians 3:17-19.
- Romans 5:13-14 states that there was sin in the world from Adam to Moses even though there was no Law.
- Romans 9:4 Says the Law and the ritual were drawn up for Israel, long after Abraham died. So this includes the whole Law as written by Moses, not just the sacrificial/temple parts.

So there is plenty of fuel for debate on the subject of whether or not a set of laws as we know it, was in force pre-Moses. The pro-tithers would have to prove the case that there was such a set of Laws, before they even begin to try to convince us that a Levitical type tithe was included in it.

That debate is not our purpose today, however, mainly because there is nothing on the pro-tithe side of the issue to provide any evidence for a debate. I only mention it in order to bring up the fact that evidence indicates that Abraham lived in a whole different paradigm than that which existed for Israel after The Law was given to Moses.

We know that a Levitical type tithe was practically impossible during Abraham's time because there was not the community or societal structure in which to do it. Abraham was a stranger in a strange land, do not forget. He even had to send an agent far away to find a wife for his son Isaac.
Abraham was following some kind of moral instructions, otherwise God would not have acknowledged his obedience. The issue at hand is whether or not those unspecified laws, precepts and commandments that Abraham was keeping are of any concern for us to speculate on today. Surely, anything relevant from Abraham’s time would have been incorporated into the Mosaic Law and the teachings/commandments of Jesus Christ that we have readily available to us now. We do not need to look for or speculate on any secret laws that preachers like this tell us are hidden in the vagueness of Genesis.

We have a few choices in answering what Genesis 26:5 is talking about. One thought is this law referred to consisted entirely of God’s personal instructions to Abraham, just as it was with Adam.

Another idea is that Abraham intuitively lived under a set of unwritten rules that that had a moral similarity to that written by Moses, but of which we have no formalized copy or specific working knowledge. In other words it was written on his heart, or in his DNA to put it in modern terms. That would explain why Abraham, though not perfect, was the best choice as the alpha type stock from which to procreate the Israel race.

In either case, the exact rules are something that we are not familiar with, since we do not have a reference guide to consult as we do with the Mosaic Law. We would have to look at Abraham’s activities and behavior, and then resort to assuming which of his actions are the result of Law-keeping and which are just general human nature or even sinfulness.

I will not speculate on details of what kind of law Abraham lived under and then guess as to what was the same, and what was different than the Mosaic Law. This type of conjecture proves fruitless for those seeking facts because the information is just not there.

Conjecture does seem to work wonders however, for those who create false doctrines. The fact is that we don’t know the facts pertaining to the specific laws, if any, of the era in which Abraham lived.

Instead of speculating, I will reiterate that Abraham himself deferred to the Mosaic Law as the authority for us to follow in Luke 16:29-31: “Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them. And he said, Nay, father Abraham: but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent.
And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.”

Note that Abraham gives authority to “Moses and the prophets” (What is commonly known as “God’s Law”). He does not refer to the “Abrahamic Precedent” or “Melchisadek Model” as the previously mentioned pro-tithe preacher would have us believe he would. Abraham probably did not do so because of the fact that those two alternatives to God’s Law are bogus and never legitimately existed outside of someone’s wishful thinking.

This agrees completely with the words of Jesus Christ in John 7:19 “Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you keepeth the law?”

So if God’s Law, as written by Moses is good enough to be endorsed at that time by Abraham and Jesus Christ, is that not the Law we should pay attention to? Or should we instead give heed to fables of some other unknown, undefined law that is created and changed at the preacher’s speculative, self-serving whim?

If we follow the Law as written by Moses (or better yet those concepts put forth by Christ himself), then we do not need to be sidetracked by any other so-called models, precedents, or exaggerated misdirecting claims about the significance of Abraham’s tithe to Melchisadek.

Hebrews 7:11-12 says “If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.”

That is saying that the Law came from Moses, not Abraham, because that is what created and defined the Levitical priesthood that was established to teach the Law (and receive tithes). That Levitical system was replaced with a Melchizedek paradigm of having Jesus as high priest therefore the rules needed to be changed.

We are told by some of today’s preachers to keep everything written in the Law of Moses, minus that which pertained to the sacrifices, because that is “what was added”. Of course that is an opinion, and pro-tithers say the tithe
was not added, citing the example of Abraham tithing to Melchizedek long before Moses.

Again, the anomaly of Abraham’s tithe bears almost no resemblance to the tithe instructed by Moses, so how can it be the same law, or even relevant to today’s tithe issue? That event was a *totally different kind of tithe* so it was not particularly done in obedience to, or in defiance to God’s Law, it was just something *that Abraham did*. Abraham was the *only person in known Biblical history* to ever do that particular type of tithe, and he only did it *once* that we know of.

This does not include yet a third type of tithe in Egypt that Abraham paid under circumstances totally unrelated to Melchizedek or Levitical law, according to Jasher.

**In the Eye of the Beholder**

Abraham lived a long life and did many things, but not every move that he made is necessarily something for us to imitate. Abraham put his wife Sarah in harm's way twice in order to protect himself: once in Egypt (Gen 12:13) and once in Gerar (Gen 20:12).

In both cases he represented Sarah as his sister, not his wife, and was willing to let her become a concubine or wife of those in power as a means of providing for Abraham’s safety. Furthermore, Abraham’s son Isaac did the exact same thing with his wife Rebekah in Genesis 26:6-11. We have three scriptural examples of this appeasement strategy, with the third taking place just after God instructs Isaac and is quoted as saying "Because Abraham obeyed Me and kept My charge, My commandments, My statutes and My laws."

So is this "throw your wife to the wolves" strategy something that is referred to in that quote as being a law, charge, commandment or statute that we are to emulate?

As improbable and as unrelated as that thought is, it is still has much better odds of being true, than does the pro-tithe assertion that the above quote is referring to a tithe to Melchizedek made decades earlier. The anomalous non-Levitical tithe has only *one example* in scripture, while the human shield tactic is related to us three times; the last being immediately after God's words about Abraham's obedience.
So, how many lessons or examples could be “spun” out of those three incidents? Many.

For example someone could say:
1. Abraham was using the logic and resourcefulness that God gave him in looking out for his own best interests.
2. A wife is the husband’s property and he can put her out to prostitution if he so desires.
3. A wife is there to protect her husband at any cost.
4. A wife is there to obey her husband at any cost.
5. Abraham showed great faith by putting Sarah at risk, “because he knew God would deliver both of them safely”.
6. Abraham was a gutless, craven coward for committing this act.
7. Abraham was obeying God’s charge, His commandments, His statutes and His laws by implementing this plan.
8. Et cetera.

As you can see, various take-away lessons could be gotten from these three identical situations, dependent solely on how the preacher wants to present it. Any, all, or none of them may be true, and Abraham could be made to look like a man of faith, or a cad if the preacher wants to do so. His preaching angle would certainly not be limited to the number of positions that I have listed here.

The point is that just because Abraham did it, it does not make every preaching about that act an accurate representation of how we are to live based on that example, because the preacher's view of it could be way off base.

We have not heard the three above-mentioned scriptures regularly expounded upon one way or another, perhaps because it is very difficult to create a positive message from them, combined with the fact that there is nothing to financially gain from it.

Not so with Genesis 14:20 and the tithe to Melchizedek. This scripture could be preached from several different aspects, but instead is repeatedly and almost universally preached with the intent of convincing the congregation to pay a tenth of their income to the church corporation, or preacher. They do so,
even though Hebrews 7 clearly explains a totally different significance to that event; Abraham’s willful submission to Melchizedek as a priest of the “Most High God” had no financial connotations tacked on to it at all.

In light of this fact, one could easily make the case that the reason that the tithe to Melchizedek was so extremely dissimilar to the tithe described in God’s Law, is that it was done that way for the express purpose of isolating it from being confused with a lawful Levitical tithe.

The circumstances of this event seem to deliberately provide plenty of evidence, and an element of reason into the situation that was meant to identify this event as being unique; to prevent this scripture from being abused the way pro-tithers have done.

The Blind Eye of the Beholder

A pro-tithe self-proclaimed “seer” and “prophet” that I knew did a series of study sermons on “The Law”. While he did agree that the sacrifices, the temple, and the Levitical class were all done away with, he schizophrenically still promoted a tithe and accepted tithe money; the basis for which has its origins in that part of the Law that he accepted as being obsolete. This is not unusual.

**Even if** there were some as yet undiscovered information to prove that scripture-based tithing existed on a widespread scale before the time of Moses, it would not by itself prove the requirement of a modern day tithe, because we are dealing with a certain degree of change in the Law that has obviously affected the tithe.

If circumcision was made obsolete, becoming a spiritual “circumcision of the heart” (Romans 2:29), then why not the obvious obsolescence of the tithe as well? Along with stone temple (gone), the animal sacrifices (gone), and Levitical priesthood (gone) that the tithe (also gone) was so intimately associated with and specifically applied to?

I do not see these preachers that make their fortunes from tithe money as self-proclaimed neo-Levitical quasi-priests, also wearing fringes and blue ribbons (Numbers 15:28, Deut 22:12), or wearing untrimmed beards (Lev 19:27), or completely shaving his body (Numbers 8:7) or

> "Because of its extreme generality this verse is absolutely irrelevant as proof of any specific law, let alone proof that a tithe always existed."
taking only a virgin as a wife, or excluding himself from preaching because of a missing eye or limb or other physical injury or malformation (Lev 21:17-21), or washing his hands and feet in a footed brass basin before he preaches (Exodus 30:18-20), or observing many of the other laws of that time.

How about restrictions on inheritance? Or prohibitions against owning agriculturally productive land? These were required trade-offs that Levites were subject to, as part of their tithe-receiving status, but they are ignored by tithe promoters today.

Numbers 18:23-24  “But the Levites shall do the service of the tabernacle of the congregation, and they shall bear their iniquity: it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations, that among the children of Israel they have no inheritance.

But the tithes of the children of Israel, which they offer as an heave offering unto the LORD, I have given to the Levites to inherit: therefore I have said unto them, Among the children of Israel they shall have no inheritance.”

The tithe promoting preachers seem to pick and choose the good laws from the bad laws as it fits their purpose. They seem to want Levitical and priestly honor and privileges, but not Levitical responsibilities, restrictions, or regulations. They also seem to have established a pattern of making these determinations based on their own best interests i.e. what is profitable and expedient for them, and what is not.

If there were changes made from one covenant to another, we have to abide by the latest changes. The New Testament indicates a discontinuance of animal sacrifices and a Levitical class of priests, which no one seems to have a problem with. But for some reason, when we include the tithe with the closely associated extinct Levites and demolished temple, it seems to cause spasmodic kniption fits and eye-bulging vascular events among preachers.

The bottom line is that it is inarguable that changes have been made, and Jesus is the last word on that, since He speaks for God (John 8:28-31,40). Jesus tells us how to “Give to God”, but as we shall see in coming chapters, protithers disregard His words on several subjects entirely.

Faith vs. Law-keeping, vs. Works
James 2:21-24 helps clarify the essence of Abraham's obedience: "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God.

Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."

Though the KJV is not the clearest interpretation, we can still see that James highlights this incident with Isaac as being the notable example of Abraham's faith put into action; not his tithe to Melchizedek as the pro-tithers would like to have us believe. There is nothing in scripture that ties Genesis 26:5 or James 2:21-24 to the fact that Abraham had made a tithe to Melchizedek. The real, non-financial significance of that act is explained in Hebrews 7 which we cover in the next chapter.

As mentioned above, Paul expounds on the other side of the coin: faith that precedes action. Romans 3:20-28 for example points out that Law-keeping, though commendable, takes a back seat to faith. Paul goes on through Romans Chapter Four explaining that it was Abraham's faith that made him righteous, not his Law-keeping or lack thereof. This takes the wind out of the sails of the pro-tithe presumptions about Genesis 26:5 - "Because Abraham obeyed Me and kept My charge, My commandments, My statutes and My laws."

Somewhere between the teachings of James and Paul is a balance of applying actions to faith to achieve righteousness, but this is a topic for another book.

The point of all this is that no matter how much faith a person may have, or how much Law-keeping they try to keep up with, neither of these two Apostles (nor any other Scriptural instructions) define righteousness as only following The Law, or only having faith. I mean, tithing away someone else's property requires neither faith or Law-keeping.

Above all else, scripture never associates righteousness with worshipping idols or following false doctrines such as today's tithe, no matter how well-intentioned the tither is. If there is any "faith" or "law-keeping" attached to modern tithing at all, it is faith in the preachers' teachings, and the keeping of a man-made law; a law that cannot be found in any scripture that applies to us today.
Think about it. The context of the story about Melchizedek proves that the tithe that took place was one that had parameters that were different from those detailed by Moses later on. Therefore if it was a law or custom of some sort, and not just Abraham's decision at that moment, then it was of a man-made nature because it was a different tithe than any scripturally defined tithe law that we are familiar with.

Namely, it was a tithe on something that did not represent an increase (It did not even represent Abraham's property); it was tithe on something other than food; and it went to a non-Levite. All of which run counter to God's Levitical tithe Law. Not to mention that this one lone event in the life of Abraham was, as well as Jacob's situation, done under very extraordinary circumstances.

We know for a fact that the Mosaic Law tithe had only three variations. In one case the tithed food went to the Levites, in another case it went to the widows, orphans, sojourning Levites, and strangers; and in a third case the farmer sold the tithe/produce and used the money to contribute to a good time for yourself and others at the feast day events (Deut 14:23-26). Melchizedek qualified as none of the above.

All three of these Lawful tithes are basically ignored by preachers today, who instead promote almost exclusively the invented, non-scriptural doctrine of a fifth tithe: cash tithe to the preacher, on income from any and all sources. This is a doctrine totally alien to both Old and New Covenants, including Abraham's tithe to Melchizedek, and this is also the kind of bogus tithe that they want you to believe God was referring to when He said "Because Abraham obeyed Me and kept My charge, My commandments, My statutes and My laws."

The Arrogance of Wealth and Worldliness

For the sake of argument let's ignore everything we've seen so far, and assume that the pro-tithers are totally right - that Abraham really did have this tremendous gain that he felt

"They take an incredible special event, which is how scripture treats this story, then they try to impute the greatness of Melchizedek to themselves (the preachers) in order to get free money."
obligated to tithe from so he tithed to Melchizedek. Is this somehow an example for us to now tithe to the preachers?

Hebrews 7:1-4 describes Melchizedek this way:

For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him; To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is, King of peace; Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually. Now consider how great this man was, unto whom even the patriarch Abraham gave the tenth of the spoils.

Well, let us do just that: Let’s consider how great this Melchizedek was who had no genealogical record, but was made comparable somehow only to Jesus Christ Himself.

Except apparently, in the eyes of the preachers who compare themselves to Melchizedek when they use this as an example for you to tithe to them.

When you get right down to it, that is exactly what they are doing. They take an incredible special event, which is how scripture treats this story, then they try to impute the greatness of Melchizedek to themselves (the preachers) in order to get free money. They will condemn and ridicule the concept of a Pope, or a witch doctor, or some hippie in the park who claims to be Jesus, but these same pro-tithe preachers will somehow equate themselves as a proxy for Melchizedek based on this story.

They’ll say something like:

“If Abraham tithed to Melchizedek, surely you should be tithing to Jesus, who is the anti-type of the first Melchizedek. Do you non-tithers think you are better than Abraham?”

By framing the question like this, they can force the answer that they want, and make it sound logical. The answer of course is “No, we are not greater than Abraham”, which leaves the inevitable (desired) conclusion that “well then, you had better tithe”.

The question should really be: “Do you preachers think you are as great as Melchizedek, if you expect us to tithe to you, based on this scripture?“

Assuming that they say “no”(but don’t count on it), then the follow up question becomes “Then why should we tithe anything to you? You are not a Melchizedek priest”.
These paid preachers do not even work for Melchizedek - they work for themselves. Melchizedek was a priest of the "Most High God" who was recognized as such not only by Abraham and the other Hebrews, but also the Canaanites and nearby Phoenicians. This Most High God was not known by the name of Yahweh at that time.

Preachers are trained in using words, and they use words as tools to manipulate the thoughts of others. However, there is a way to defend yourself: Whenever they lay some line on you like giving to God, or tithing to Jesus, or honor God with your wealth or God-robber; just realize what they really mean. Mentally substitute “me” (the preacher) for “God”, and you will have a more accurate understanding of what is really going on and being said.

So a realistic interpretation of what they are saying is: “giving to God” means giving to me, “tithing to Jesus the King” means tithing to me, your pastor, “honor God with your wealth” means honor me with your wealth. “God-robber” means preacher-robber, because now he cannot buy the new SUV, golf clubs or private college for his spoiled kids, or engage in other scripture-defying activities with the money that you thought was going to do God’s work and being used for commendable purposes.

The Old Covenant defines “Honoring God with your wealth” and Jesus himself also told us how to financially and materially give to Him. Both descriptions disqualify 99.9% of the preachers that we know today. This subject is covered in Chapter 24: "True Giving to God".
Chapter 7
Hebrews 7

We have gone for many pages about Abraham’s tithe to Melchizedek, trying to clarify what it was, and what it was not. I hope I have provided abundant information to indicate how anomalous and strikingly dissimilar this event was to any tithe described in God’s Law. We have also seen that it basically stands alone as the one and only scripture that records a tithe actually taking place outside of the Mosaic/Levitical tithe paradigm.

The Genesis account provides no particular reason as to why this tithe took place, or guidelines as to when, where, or how we could possibly engage in this activity using this story as a guideline; or if in fact it even should be engaged in by anyone else based on this incident. Without other supporting scripture to clarify the circumstances, we cannot realistically infer from it any kind of example to follow. We certainly cannot apply it as an excuse to force some people to tithe to others.

This is true particularly in light of Hebrews 7 which calls attention to this event, but in a manner which is totally absent any pro-tithe implications.

The Book of Hebrews chapter 7 which illuminates Genesis 14:20, is all about Melchizedek, not about the tithe. The subject of tithe in that chapter is just the means of communicating the real point of that writing. That point apparently being to identify the social superiority of Melchizedek to Abraham, evidenced by the fact that he was the one who was being tithed to.

The tone of Hebrews 7 leaves the definite impression that Abraham’s tithe was optional, and done by his own choice. This being a voluntary act, it had a much greater meaning than compulsory tithing did in the days of Moses.

Hebrews also reminds us of two commonly held thoughts: the lesser person tithes to the greater, underscored by the greater person blesses the lesser. Both of which took place in Genesis 14.

Any significance attached to Jacob’s vow to tithe also lies in the fact that it was of his own volition. In neither of these two cases was the act due to the compulsion of any known law, as would be the case with a Levitical tithe or other...
mandatory type of tithe tax. The voluntary nature of these two acts is what gives them any real meaning at all.

I mean, if there was a law requiring gentlemen to lay their coat on a puddle so a lady can walk across without getting mud on her shoes, then Sir Walter Raleigh’s alleged act of doing so for the Queen of England would not have made him famous, would it?

The point of that whole story is that he went the extra mile; he did more than was expected of him. It was a voluntary gesture that displayed extraordinary thoughtfulness, gallantry, sacrifice, and in his case perhaps some strategic showmanship.

Likewise with the tithe - If Abraham had paid a routine mandatory tithe (such as the Levitical tithe), or a tithe for political reasons, then to be consistent Hebrews would also have to state how great a man the Egyptian king was, just as emphatically as it did about Melchizedek, because Abraham tithed to both of them.

But there is something else going on here; something fundamentally different. The difference has to be in why Abraham tithed in each case. In Egypt, Abraham tithed because he had to. He had no way to successfully resist the Egyptian guard. This type of tax-paying is not noteworthy one way or the other. It is not particularly good or bad; you just do it to avoid punishment, not because you are honoring or willfully submitting to the ruler or the taxing authority.

For example, Jesus had Peter catch a fish to pay a temple tax, but we do not hear about “how great that taxing entity was, because Jesus submitted to it” or anything else to that effect. They just paid it to avoid unnecessary trouble.

Moses as well, had to tithe to someone, presumably Aaron, because Moses was a Levite, but Aaron was a Levitical priest. Yet we never hear about how great Aaron or any other individuals were just because a great personage like Moses tithed to them. That is because it was a requirement under the Law of God, not a choice made by Moses.

"However, a voluntary tithe for honorary purposes, along with the implied submission that goes with that act is a big deal, especially for a man of high stature like Abraham,"

"
A more succinct example would be to ask yourself if you consider the clerks at the tax office to be of a higher class than you, simply because they are receiving your tax payment. Are you giving them the money to honor them, or because you have to under threat of harm to yourself or your property by the government?

So from these examples we see that just because someone has obtained a position as a cog in the governmental authority machine, this does not mean that they are necessarily held in a position of honor by those who acquiesce to the requirements of the ruling power structure. Paying taxes today, or tithes to the Levites are both simply societal obligations done under various degrees of duress.

However, a voluntary tithe for honorary purposes, along with the implied submission that goes with that act was a big deal, particularly in light of the fact that expressing honor, appreciation, respect, and sometimes submission was the whole reason for many of the tithes of that era in the first place.

For a man of high stature like Abraham to offer a tithe to someone was especially noteworthy, and Hebrews 7 identifies it as such. Doing God’s Will carries more weight than just following His Law, and the difference between a mandatory tithe and a freewill tithe-offering is as significant as it is between being drafted into the army and volunteering for hazardous duty. It indicates two totally different levels of commitment.

That is the whole thrust of what Hebrews chapter 7 is talking about. It is calling attention to the greatness of the first Melchizedek, because of Abraham’s willing act of honoring him, and tying it in with the fact that Jesus Christ is the second of only two Melchizedek priests known in the history of the world.

Abraham was revered and honored by the ancient Hebrews, perhaps as much as Jesus Christ is by Christians today. Well, maybe not quite. Can you imagine if there was an account of Jesus honoring and deferring to someone on Earth that was greater than Himself? We would want to kind of sit up and take notice as to who that person was that the King of Kings was voluntarily submitting to, wouldn’t we? That was also the desired effect that Hebrews 7
intended: “open your eyes people, there is a new Melchizedek King and Priest in town”.

Hebrews 7:5-6 “And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who receive the office of the priesthood, have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham: But he whose descent is not counted from them received tithes of Abraham, and blessed him that had the promises.”

So this scripture points out the anomaly; a distinct deviation from normalcy. To understand these two verses correctly, tithing to the Levites was done as a result of God’s commandment; tithing to Melchizedek was not. A gift is a gift, but a gift of a tithe (like Abraham’s) in the context of that time period, was an act of submission. It was Abraham’s choice to make this exceptional offering or gift; that was the whole point. He made his gift in what at that time was the much more symbolic form of a tithe. The fact that it was not his property does not seem to matter to the point being made by that scripture. The main point was that Abraham submitted to Melchizedek as being greater than himself.

A simple, mandated tithe to God does not seem to be the issue here, because that would not be a big deal since everyone knows that God is sovereign over all. We all know that Abraham submitted to God and had on occasion made offerings/sacrifices to Him. So if Abraham was just fulfilling a requirement to tithe to someone who was ordained by God to receive it, that would not particularly impress anyone as to the greatness of Melchizedek, because it only would have made him an authorized tithe recipient like the Levites were.

Hebrews 7 indicates that any realistic theory about what was happening at the Valley of Kings on that day has to necessarily include the concept that Abraham’s presentation of this tithe was done voluntarily, and with the intention of honoring Melchizedek. This was clearly a willful act of fealty to Melchizedek, otherwise the point of Hebrews Chapter 7 would not make any sense.

Additionally, the Bible records this as a unique event, and gives us no indication that any similar event has ever taken place at any other time, before or since. These basic facts alone are all we really need to know in order to realize that even though Abraham’s tithe was notable for the purpose of glorifying Melchizedek, it cannot be used prima facie as any kind of evidence for us to tithe today to any preacher.
Section Three:

**Counterfeit Old Covenant “Tithe Scriptures”**

The following scriptures used for pro-tithe purposes are really non-tithe, or very general tithe-neutral scriptures. They are embellished by preachers' personal opinions and techniques of persuasion in order to give the impression that they are scriptures that support a modern tithe. In reality they are nothing of the sort. Their original meaning and intent are obliterated and replaced by an invented, “counterfeit” meaning when they are used for pro-tithe purposes.

In other cases they are scriptures applied in an irrelevant manner because they fall under the Levitical Tithe Law which was applicable back then, but is now obsolete, according to scripture.

Tithe doctrine and lore is rife with deceptive examples like these. They are used regularly to help create this “myth of the tithe” that we hear so much about.
Chapter 8
Cain and Abel’s Offering:
Sides A and B (Genesis 4:2-5)

So far, I have heard two totally different pro-tithe positions based on this scripture, both of which seem to me as being nothing short of theological malpractice. This is a good example of how the same scripture can be packaged and sold in different ways based on where the preacher’s imagination leads him. In this case both of the preachers apparently had the same pre-conceived financial goal in mind; they just went about their task from two different fictional angles.

We can see that Genesis 4:2-5 is very basic: "And she again bare his brother Abel. And Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground. And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the LORD. And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the LORD had respect unto Abel and to his offering: But unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect. And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell."

Add to that Hebrews 11:4 "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, through which he had witness borne to him that he was righteous, God bearing witness in respect of his gifts"

The A-side of the pro-tithe tale says that Cain’s sacrifice/offering was rejected because it was not a full 10%.

In the reality of the clearly stated fact, this was an offering, not a tithe. This is a textbook example of how pro-tithers deliberately confuse the concept of a tithe with other non-tithe activities that had taken place in scripture.

Tithe (tenth) is not mentioned, and has nothing whatsoever to do with an offering (gift) or sacrifice, which as we can see is the case here.

This event took place long before there were any Levites to give the tithe to. (Remember - all the tithe goes to the Levites, according to the Law) There were no temples, there was no Aaronic priesthood, not even a Melchizedek priest. There was nowhere for a tithe to go to, according to any known law. That is why these brothers were performing their own sacrifice. These
sacrifices were offerings; acts of appreciation, acknowledgement, and/or submission to God the Creator, and in some cases for atonement for sin.

The concept of freewill offerings such as Cain and Abel's has been around since the beginning; the tithe has not.

This A-side preacher could only make his point if he went to the Septuagint and read Genesis 4:3-7 “And when in the process of time Cain brought of the fruit of the earth a sacrifice to the Lord, and Abel also brought of the firstlings of his flock even some of the fattest of them, God looked upon Abel and on his gifts; but upon Cain and upon his sacrifices he did not look with regard.

Thereupon Cain exceedingly grieved and his countenance became dejected. And the Lord God said to Cain, “Why art thou become sorrowful and why is thy countenance dejected?”

“Though thou hast offered right, yet if thou hast not rightly divided, hast thou not sinned? Be composed. To thee shall be his recourse, and thou shalt rule over him.”

The preacher's point in all this is that Cain had “not rightly divided”. That is, he had not rightly divided a full 10% of his harvest to include in his sacrifice, so that is why God rejected it. Therefore the preacher’s message went like this:

If you don’t want God to snub you and your family like he did to Cain, and if you really want to “stomp Satan”, and if you want to get your share of the billions and trillions of dollars that God is surely going to soon transfer from the world bankers to the hands of the true “Christian remnant”, then you’d better pay a full ten percent of your income “after (income tax) withholding”.

Of course the implication was for this money to go to him.

So, never mind the fact that scripture clearly says that this was a sacrifice to God, and never mind the fact that “tithe” or “tenth” is not attributed to Abel's acceptable offering at all, let alone is ten percent mentioned within a scriptural mile of these verses. This man says that this scripture depicts Cain as specifically chintzing out on paying a full 10% tithe; and that's that.

Noah made a similar offering (Genesis 8:20) with no mention of a tenth. Abraham almost sacrificed Isaac who was his first son, not his tenth (Gen 22:2). Jacob made an offering (Genesis 35:14) with no tenth part of anything indicated. Moses negotiated with Pharaoh to provide cattle and to let Israel go
out to serve and make offerings to Yahweh God. He said nothing about taking one tenth of the herd (Exodus 10:25) to offer to Yahweh.

But for some unknown reason according to this pro-tithe modern “seer”, Cain was chastised by God for not offering a “full tithe” as a sacrifice.

I didn’t go to preacher college, but I did graduate from Kindergarten. Even then I learned that things can be grouped in different ways. I remember the “What Does Not Belong?” pictures, where we were supposed to circle the item that did not fit with the rest.

Similarly, a person can “rightly divide” things according to shape, color, relevance and quality as well as quantity. It is not rocket surgery to be able to figure that out.

Did you notice that Abel’s offering had a high quality (some of the fattest) to it, while there is no mention of quality pertaining to Cain’s offering? Maybe Cain did not “rightly divide” his offering of produce according to bruises on the fruit and weed seeds and chaff in the grain. Maybe he had a lackadaisical or selfish attitude in preparing this sacrifice. Remember, “sacrifice” means to give up something. It is not a sacrifice if you give up things that you did not want anyway, such as produce that might otherwise be destined for the compost pile.

Since offerings like this are mainly symbolic, token amounts and have very little to do with quantity, but have much to do with quality, presentation, and absolutely nothing to do with ten percent, could the reason for God’s rejection perhaps be due to Cain’s lack of diligence?

The Septuagint that the preacher quotes from is a fine book that, because of variances in the text, often clarifies the meaning of certain scriptures in the regular Bible.

The Book of Jasher, while not particularly a book of my choice, is also used by preachers including pro-tithers as an extra-Biblical source to clarify and support certain scriptures.

It says the following in Jasher 1:16, the paragraph that corresponds to Genesis 4:5:

"...if they don’t cook the scriptures to say what they want them to say, they would have no arguments to present at all."
“And unto Cain and his offering the Lord did not turn, and he did not incline to it, for he had brought from the inferior fruit of the ground before the Lord, and Cain was jealous”…etc.

So we can see that it takes only a minimal amount of looking in the pro-tithe library to find very plausible, reasonable details that clarify this issue perfectly. The information is in a book that preachers will quote when it suits their purpose. If this preacher found a phrase in the Septuagint that he could use as an angle to spin it all into a pro-tithe anecdote, you can bet he or his staff searched Jasher as well. This time the preacher did not mention Jasher because Jasher contradicted what the preacher wanted us to believe.

The problem with Cain’s offering is described as quality control which perhaps reflected a heart (attitude/spirit) problem. There are obviously no tithe implications here whatsoever, so why would the preacher even bring this story into the tithe discussion?

They bring it up because if they do not make up fictional arguments like this; if they do not cook the scriptures to say what they want them to say, they would have no arguments to present at all. In fact they could not make the scriptures say what they wanted them to, even in this case. Instead, the preacher just took scriptures that said one thing, and he just overrode it with a hard-sell, saying that it meant something else entirely.

Now, to be fair, at least in his presentation the first preacher gave you an allowance for the money that the government stole from you through withholding tax. This next pro tithe preacher wants his money off the top, before taxes.

Cain and Abel: the B-Side

This other preacher delivers another version of the tithe myth concerning this very same event; this effort says that Cain and Abel were presenting a “first-fruit tithe” (which is a completely invented term).

According to this preacher (and again, it is almost a given that this man knew what Jasher says on the subject, before he presented this tale), Cain’s offering was rejected because it was not “first-fruits” necessary for a “first fruit tithe”. Well, that might have been possible among the beanstalks and
gingerbread churches of preacherworld, but in the harsh reality of Planet Earth his story is an impossibility. Just as the concept of a “tithe” is absent from that story, so also is the notion of a “first-fruit” nowhere to be found there, let alone this new hybrid term that the preacher pulled out of his sleeve.

The real mystery to his tale is how this preacher got away with using a bastardized, meaningless term like “first-fruit tithe” in his effort to morph this clearly defined sacrifice or offering into being some kind of tithe.

End-run Double-Talk

According to that preacher, even if there is not a New Covenant tithe in effect today, as a preacher he is still owed a “10% first fruit tithe”; because the Law of “first fruits” is still applicable. Otherwise “you’re a God-robber” (emphasis is his).

Really? These rebellious yellow preachers have tried various end-run tactics in deliberate efforts to nullify the instructions of the true tithe Law. In doing so, they are “making the Word of God of none effect”. In this case, we see it is the invention of a “law” of the verbally miscegenous term “first fruit tithe”. A term which to the pro-tithe preachers means a 10% haircut off the top of your paycheck, before taxes, because if it is after you have paid taxes on it, then it is not really “first fruits”, is it?

I am amazed at how people will reject even the historical reference value of ancient writings like the Book of Thomas, or Enoch, etc. because they are not “in the Bible”, while at the same time they will swallow hook, line, and sinker the newly crafted and invented deceptions which are also not in the Bible, but are believed to be the truth of the Bible, just because they hear it from a preacher. This “first-fruit tithe” is one of those fish stories that just may take the cake.

First Fruit Facts - Rightly Dividing Tithe from Offerings

To begin with, if the concept of first fruits was applicable today, it would be concerning agricultural production and not money, just like the tithe was. After all, it is called “first fruits”, not “first cash”, “first income” or “first coin”, or anything else indicating non-food items.
Secondly, if it did somehow magically apply to cash income, in order for it to be analogous it would have to be given only from the first payday (so-called “first harvest”) of your new job, or business endeavor; not taken from all of the income produced for the rest of your life. So even upon entering their self-serving fantasy world of pro-tithe scriptural interpretation, we can see that their theory does not work.

“First fruit tithe” is yet another step further removed from reality however, than their perpetual first-fruit-on-all-income doctrine.

The term “first fruit tithe” is an oxymoron; a fizzled attempt at spell casting - the tying of two opposites into one term. Think about it, people; how do you give a “tithe” of a harvest that has not been made yet, but has only about to be commenced?

“First fruits” is not tithe, but a wave offering; a small symbolic cut or picking of the harvest made prior to, or at the very onset of harvest to acknowledge God’s goodness in creating the anticipated bountiful increase. It may be a larger amount, particularly for special events, but it is absurd to claim that it is 10% of the crop.

Tithe of course is not first fruits but a heave of one tenth of the harvest as a whole, made after the harvest is accomplished. Nehemiah 10:37 for example distinguishes the two as separate issues:

“And that we should bring the firstfruits of our dough, and our offerings, and the fruit of all manner of trees, of wine and of oil, unto the priests, to the chambers of the house of our God; and the tithes of our ground unto the Levites, that the same Levites might have the tithes in all the cities of our tillage.” (Again it is obvious - “tillage” means agricultural production, not industry, crafts and trades, commerce, etc)

So you have first fruits and offerings going to the priests (and prophets [2Kings 4:42] which could be non-Levites [1Kings 19:19]), and tithes, being a particular heave offering made only to the lower class of Levites. So are we to assume that this preacher is now claiming to hold the position of not only a Levite but also a priest as well, by claiming your tithe and your first fruits?

You will find that these income-tithe promoting preachers will at times claim to be Levites, and at other times priests; depending on what they can get away with at the moment. In this case it is both at the same time. Of course many
love the title of "prophet" best of all because, psychologically at least, that trumps everything; after all, you can't argue with a prophet.

Here is the law on first-fruits:

**Leviticus 23:10** “Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of the firstfruits of your harvest unto the priest:”

This “sheaf” could be as much as you can fit your hand around, about 2-3” diameter, or perhaps slightly larger or smaller.

**Deut 26:2-4** “That thou shalt take of the first of all the fruit of the earth, which thou shalt bring of thy land that the LORD thy God giveth thee, and shalt put it in a basket, and shalt go unto the place which the LORD thy God shall choose to place His name there.

And thou shalt go unto the priest that shall be in those days, and say unto him, “I profess this day unto the LORD thy God, that I am come unto the country which the LORD swear unto our fathers for to give us.” And the priest shall take the basket out of thine hand, and set it down before the altar of the LORD thy God.”

Unless it is a really bad year, who can fit a tenth of the harvest into a basket as if it were Dorothy’s dog Toto? Is one sheaf equal to a tenth of your harvest? Not unless you are growing it in window boxes. Likewise with your fruit or vegetable harvest - how many pumpkins are you going to fit in that basket?

Notice also that this offering was taken to the priest. Tithes were instructed to go to the Levites. Also, notice the instructions for the verbal confession that is to be recited every time this presentation takes place (I have added quotation marks for clarity). Do you think for one second that this preacher requires this statement to accompany every “first fruit cash tithe” that he has tried to convince others to give him?

So where did this preacher get a “first fruit tithe” idea after reading these scriptures of the Law that give clear examples of what a first fruit offering is really supposed to be?

Answer: He made it up; it is pure poppycock, hog wash, codswallup or something more derogatory. Use your own judgment and pick your own colloquial term for what appears to be pure fictional propaganda.

Furthermore and as if that evidence was not enough, these first fruit offerings were specifically coupled with animal sacrifices as part of the deal
(Leviticus 23:14-20) “throughout all your generations”. So it is both or nothing in those cases. You either must sacrifice a lamb with this first fruit offering concept, or if you believe that Jesus was the final sacrifice, then the first fruit offering goes the same way as the sacrifices did. Who has the right to decide how to split this ritual? Not to mention that as we defined earlier, offerings of any type went only to the priest and not the average Levite. The priest is the intercessor between the people and God. Is your preacher a priest to you?

Once again as a side note – Does “fruit of the earth” sound like your payment for building, or manufacturing, or sales commissions, or any other non-agricultural financial income?

An additional side note - Deuteronomy 12:13 says "Take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt offerings in every place that thou seest:

But in the place which the LORD shall choose in one of thy tribes, there thou shalt offer thy burnt offerings, and there thou shalt do all that I command thee."

So if you are attending some kind of church services at which you are giving cash offerings instead of burnt offerings, this scripture says that you are not to do it at any old place chosen by people, but somewhere specified by God Himself.

Who ever said that God has “placed His name” with your particular preacher for you to bring this offering to, or with your particular church denomination, as this scripture stipulates must be the case? The answer to that is evident: “Your preacher did”, or the billboard said so, or the radio ad strongly implied it. (It is actually a concept born with the creation of the Roman Catholic Church, and then adopted by all the others that claim this status.) They obviously have to have some kind of justification to claim to be a proxy for God and to be able to take your tithe money on His behalf, so they just say they do, or act like it is a predisposed fact, and that seems to work.

Deuteronomy 16:5-6 states: “Thou mayest not sacrifice the passover within any of thy gates, which the LORD thy God giveth thee:

But at the place which the LORD thy God shall choose to place his name in, there thou shalt sacrifice the passover at even, at the going down of the sun, at the season that thou camest forth out of Egypt.”

"Go ahead and ask him the question about who made him God’s first fruit and tithe collector."
This term "But at the place which the LORD thy God shall choose to place his name" appears to be a significant instruction in regards to gatherings and feast day events, since it is also specified in Deuteronomy 12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21 - (that is 5 times in one chapter. Apparently this is to drive home an important point) also Deuteronomy 14:23, 16:2, 16:11.

In 1Kings 14:21, and 2Chronicles 12:13 the term is used similarly to indicate God's moral support and approval.

Go ahead and ask your preacher the question of who made him God's first fruit and tithe collector. Then ask what evidence can he produce that indicates that God has placed His name at this man's church/business, which necessarily must be the case if they are going to hang on to this Old Covenant paradigm of commercialized first fruit presentations. Let me know what he says.

On the other hand, in New Covenant terms the above-stated requirement is not necessary, since Jesus said in Matthew 18:20 "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."

Since the temple is gone, this scripture is the closest thing we have to providing a New Covenant equivalent to the phrase where the LORD thy God shall choose to place his name. This averment applies to us anywhere today, but not for the same purposes that Deuteronomy 16:5-6 is talking about. Matthew 18:20 gives no exclusivity to gatherings supervised and controlled by preachers, and it certainly does not provide money collection rights to anyone at any of these gatherings.

So if the income-tithers want to ignore the New Covenant paradigm and promote for their advantage the Old Covenant instructions for tithing and first fruit giving, then they need to be unhypocritical enough to also confine themselves to the Old Covenant restrictions on these activities regarding what it is that is given, who it goes to, and where it all takes place. Cash, to today's preachers, in buildings owned by today's religious corporations, is certainly not what, who, or where it is at.

Alternatively, if in answer to your question about who made him God's tithe collector, your preacher goes the non-scriptural route and happens to refer back to the writings of the "early Christian Fathers" as his authority for making such
a claim, then he’s talking about writings of the early Catholic Church from 400 A.D. or later; not the true early Christians.

The pro-tithe preachers have presented no true scriptural basis for this claim that they represent God when taking your tithe; none that will even begin to hold water. So if he tries to lead you to believe that some old document is anything other than writings of the early Catholic establishment, he is either bluffing, defrauding, or just plain ignorant of the facts. You can decide what you want to call it.

Then you can ask yourself why they even have to resort to such documents of spurious origin to support their position. Do they not have scripture to back up their claim? By now I think you may be starting to realize that the answer to that question is: “No”. They have nothing that is not spun, distorted, or fabricated.

There are more details on Catholic documentation as it ties in with a modern tithe, in Chapter 22 "Rome: The Mother of Today's Tithe".

First Fruits Free for the Taking

Would you give one tenth of your income, or any first-fruit offerings to your mailman, your biker-gang cousin, the bartender down the street, or the junkie in the alley if they claimed to be a “man of God”?

The answer is: Yes, of course you would. Of course you would. That is, if they could convince you to do so. And therein lies the rub – what is your standard of proof? Your preacher is your “man of God” because one way or another he has convinced you that that is what he is. That fact seems to be the only criteria that really matters.

It is not because he has any God-ordained authority like the Levites did (which they do not), or because he “walks the talk” of non-materialism, like Jesus, Peter, Paul, and the other living examples of true “men of God” did. It is not because he is a scholar fluent in the Greek and Hebrew languages and can bypass the various faulty translations in order to clarify the true intent of various original scriptures. In some cases he does not even have to preach scripture at all, other than very sparingly.
He is your preacher for one of two idolatrous reasons: Either he was ordained by some church corporation and licensed by the State, or he is a good salesman like Jim Jones, who sold you the false idea that he is an anointed man of God who has "sacrificed all for Jesus" and who is out to do God's work. None of these self-descriptions have anything at all to do with being proof that he fits the qualifications of a true scripturally defined "man of God".

Today, a preacher just needs to talk a good game and grab the reins of the listeners' minds; using the Bible as a speaking prop and quoting just enough scripture to make the invented doctrines go down without a hiccup. These are the type of people that Paul, Peter, James, John, etc. warned us about in the New Covenant, and you can see these phonies *all over the place*.

Now, some preachers may be at various levels knowledgeable, sincere, and beneficial teachers, I won't deny that, but that does not automatically make them a "man of God"; particularly if they are being paid money to preach. There is also nothing wrong with being a skilled speaker. That ability combined with courage and truth makes a powerful combination. But communication skills used to convey self-serving doctrines are no substitute for truth, and quite often are used as a weapon to *neutralize* the truth and empower the speaker or his church board bosses.

New Covenant scripture defines the requirements for a "man of God" position. We will examine what that *walk* is, in the section covering New Covenant tithe arguments, and even more so in the companion book: "Men of God?'".

For the moment suffice it to say that pro-tithe (and most other) preachers bear little to no resemblance to what scripture defines as a "Man of God", and therefore the ball is in his court for the preacher to prove through objective independent sources that God has "placed His name" with him if he is claiming to be a priest that has a right to your "first fruits".

**Pick 'n' Choose the Scriptures They Like**

Regarding the preachers who mis-quote God's Law for tithe money and "first fruit money" - do they also sacrifice your first fruit animals, as scripture instructs (Leviticus 23:9-14)? Do you offer your first born son to this preacher according to Numbers 18:15, and pay a ransom to get your son back? No, people do not do these things, nor do the preachers generally want them to, but
they will surgically extract this “first fruits” idea right out from the very scriptures that also require the sacrifices, ransom payment, and other things.

Let’s be totally rebellious to these preachers for a minute, and actually read what God’s Law has to say about first fruits.

Deut 26:5-10 picks up from the first fruit scriptures that we read a page or two back. The following scripture details a required statement. It is something that must be stated when presenting the first fruits to the priest:

“And thou shalt speak and say before the LORD thy God, ‘A Syrian ready to perish was my father, and he went down into Egypt, and sojourned there with a few, and became there a nation, great, mighty, and populous: And the Egyptians evil entreated us, and afflicted us, and laid upon us hard bondage:
And when we cried unto the LORD God of our fathers, the LORD heard our voice, and looked on our affliction, and our labor, and our oppression:
And the LORD brought us forth out of Egypt with a mighty hand, and with an outstretched arm, and with great terribleness, and with signs, and with wonders:
And he hath brought us into this place, and hath given us this land, even a land that floweth with milk and honey.
And now, behold, I have brought the firstfruits of the land, which thou, O LORD, hast given me.’ And thou shalt set it before the LORD thy God, and worship before the LORD thy God:"

Did I mention that this confession is required? Everything in that scripture except the first and last lines, is required to be recited; required by the Law that these pro-tithe preachers claim to love and to teach, and which they use to justify their “first-fruits-tithe” abomination.

Clearly it is a statement of faith concerning God’s providence, and an acknowledgement of His sovereignty. The question is: Do these “law-teachers” who demand your “first fruit tithe” also require the recitation that this scripture instructs? Or are they more concerned with which pocket to put your money into?

The event described is not a tithe at all. This was done at the beginning of the harvest. That is why it is called “first fruits”.

Once the harvest was complete, they could then determine a tenth of it for the specific purpose of tithing, but not at the “first fruit” stage of harvest.
Continuing with Deut 26:11, it transitions from the subject of first fruits, and starts to talk about tithe: “And thou shalt rejoice in every good thing which the LORD thy God hath given unto thee, and unto thine house, thou, and the Levite, and the stranger that is among you.

When thou hast made an end of tithing all the tithes of thine increase the third year, which is the year of tithing, and hast given it unto the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, that they may eat within thy gates, and be filled;

Once again, tithe equals food. Any scriptural tithe is always food or agricultural produce of some kind.

We will talk about this “poor tithe” that it mentions later, but since we are in the middle of reading Deuteronomy 26, let us pause for a moment to end this chapter a bit abruptly in order to address the closely related “sovereignty” argument which is central to their pro-tithe doctrine.
Chapter 9
“Acknowledging the Sovereignty of God”

This concept of failing to “Acknowledge God’s Sovereignty” is another browbeating tool in the pro-tithe black bag of tricks. When used in an accusatory manner as preachers do, it is one their most effective intimidating hot buttons; right up there with “robbing God”. The instilling of false guilt creates a rich exploitable resource of financial gain to those who claim they can alleviate that guilt, if the victim of this tactic would only give the preacher a specified amount of money.

The pro-tithe theory is that in the Old Covenant God owned everything in the world, including the world. Since He was owner and King, He imposed a tax (the tithe) on His people because He had the right to do it and He did it. As the story goes, people acknowledged His sovereignty and honored Him by paying the tithe.

The gist of their propaganda/logic goes like this: The pro-tithers ask leading questions such as “even though there is a New Covenant now, the concept that God still owns everything has not changed, has it? Doesn’t God still own everything, and doesn’t He still reign supreme?” (Of course who can disagree with that?) “Therefore” the preacher concludes “the tithe has not changed either”.

The mental link is this: you are supposedly rebelling against God’s sovereignty, and you are an ungrateful slug of a person if you are not paying a tenth of your income to the preacher as your tribute to God’s goodness and to acknowledge His ownership of the world, and His sovereignty.

Their story goes that God cannot be God unless He has imposed a strict tax upon us, and that tax is 10%. Period. Freewill gifts and offerings alone do not cut it, because in that case you are making yourself a ruler over God by determining how much you want to give, and God does not need your good will or charity, according to them; He wants your blind, unfailing obedience and tribute of no less than 10% in the form of a cash tithe.
Let me point out that none of this is a *scriptural* argument, not by a long shot. It is the preachers’ *opinions*, their *invention*, their *hard-sell*, and it all amounts to pure Hansel and Gretel fiction. They cannot prove it scripturally so they hammer it home with a heavy dose of strong-armed salesmanship, sophistry, peer pressure and imposed guilt. They give a false choice of choosing God as your King and tithing to the preacher, or by failing to do so you are supposedly making the choice of rejecting God and having a crooked government as your king and choosing to pay taxes to that entity instead.

We know of course that their whole premise false; freewill giving is well accepted by God, and all we have to do to prove it is to read Exodus 25:1-9

“Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring me an offering: of every man that giveth it willingly with his heart ye shall take my offering.

And this is the offering which ye shall take of them; gold, and silver, and brass...”

**Exodus 35:4-29** “And Moses spake unto all the congregation of the children of Israel, saying, This is the thing which the LORD commanded, saying, take ye from among you an offering unto the LORD: whosoever is of a willing heart, let him bring it, an offering of the LORD; gold, and silver, and brass...”

These scriptures are talking about freewill offerings, *not tithe*, that is why money is allowed. Contributions to temple building or upkeep are the only known scriptural circumstance that allows cash gifts.

These were instructions for building God’s sanctuary, but they may, if further evidence supports it, apply to any kind of similar ministry expenses today, even though they contain the much detested (by pro-tithers) concept of freewill giving, which is *not the same as tithing*.

To address the red herring false discussion that tithe-takers make out of the sovereignty issue, I will point out the obvious that God *still does own* everything. That is a no-brainer. As owner and King He certainly has the right to tax, but He also has the right *not tax* as these two above-mentioned scriptures indicate. That is for God to decide, not some preacher.

"They make up *their own* law as a profitable substitute, they call it *the tithe*, and then go on to tell you and me that we are the sinners for not paying the false tax that they invented."
God did have a tax, he called it the tithe. He clearly stated that it went to the Levites only. He clearly stated that it was agricultural increase only. Like the temporary nature of the Levitical priesthood, God clearly ended the tithe that was used to feed that priesthood, when He ended the priesthood itself.

Even though God had a tax, the pro-tithe preachers do not like the clearly stated terms of God’s tax; they do not like the fact that God abolished His tax, and they do not like the concept of freewill giving so they rebel by way of subversion. They make up their own law as a profitable substitute, they call it the tithe, and then go on to tell you and me that we are the sinners for not paying the false tax that they invented.

This is text-book false prophet, false preacher, greedy dog behavior on their part.

1Samuel 2:30 God said “...for them that honor me I will honor, and they that despise me shall be as nothing.”

It is time that we of the congregation begin to realize that these false preachers are nothing that we want to be a part of. As with any other fraud, the first thing you should do is to demand your tithe money back from the defrauder.

Honoring the sovereignty of God by tithing to a preacher is like honoring the sovereignty of the Queen of England by tithing to your Pakistani high school English teacher. It makes absolutely no sense whatsoever.

Some people want to do good, and their heart is in the right place. They want to “acknowledge God’s sovereignty”, and the tithe takers exploit this good will by providing the illusion of a means for the people to do so by saying that honoring God is done through giving money to the preacher. That is what the “myth of the tithe” is all about: taking the good will of the Christian saints, converting it to money, and harvesting it into a bank account for the preacher. This is done under the guise of “honoring God’s sovereignty”, among other pro-tithe slogans.

How to Acknowledge God’s Sovereignty

So, preachers have set themselves up as the gatekeepers; the authorities who will determine for you how to “acknowledge the sovereignty of God”. In their
alleged pious wisdom they have determined that this is best accomplished by giving the preachers one tenth of your income.

Let us compare that to what scripture says. The plain fact of the matter is that “acknowledging the sovereignty of God” is not done by mailing a check to the preacher, or crossing his palm with green, or by willing your estate to him, as some preachers might claim.

Even in Old Covenant times, this acknowledgement was not particularly accomplished by paying a tithe, any more so than following the other various Laws of that time.

How do you acknowledge this divine sovereignty? As usual it is God’s Law that has the answer, not the preachers.

The deliberate acknowledgement of God’s kingship was accomplished by – first and foremost – deliberately acknowledging God’s kingship. That is right; you do it by doing it. It is not some secret thing that happens when you complete a non-taxable commercial transaction (known today as tithing) with your preacher.

I mean, how do you pledge allegiance to the flag (for those of you who still do it)? How do you say the Lord’s Prayer? You do it by doing it.

As I have shown in the last chapter, this act of acknowledgement is plainly instructed in Deut 26:5-10 for first fruit offerings. So let us now continue where that scripture and that chapter left off, regarding a similar but distinctly separate confession that goes with tithing.

Deut 26:13-15: 26:13 “Then thou shalt say before the LORD thy God,

‘I have brought away the hallowed things [things set aside for tithe] out of mine house, and also have given them unto the Levite, and unto the stranger, to the fatherless, and to the widow, according to all thy commandments which thou hast commanded me: I have not transgressed thy commandments, neither have I forgotten them.

I have not eaten thereof [of items set aside for tithe, again it is food related] in my mourning, neither have I taken away ought thereof for any unclean use, nor given ought thereof for the dead: but I have hearkened to the voice of the LORD my God, and have done according to all that thou hast commanded me.

Look down from thy holy habitation, from heaven, and bless thy people Israel, and the land ["land" is Strongs #127, which is more accurately translated as “soil”, and it
gives a much stronger connotation of the agricultural nature of the tithe. The idea of a land area or territory would have been Strong's #776] which thou hast given us, as thou swearest unto our fathers, a land that floweth with milk and honey.’

This day the LORD thy God hath commanded thee to do these statutes and judgments: thou shalt therefore keep and do them with all thine heart, and with all thy soul.

Did I read that last verse right? Yet again, it says “Commanded thee to do these statutes”, and it is talking about reciting these acknowledgments that we just read about. That is, everything in that scripture except the first and last lines of it is required to be recited; just as a similar affirmation was required for presenting first fruits. These acknowledgements were an essential part of both the first fruit presentation and tithing processes, and both of which acknowledged the sovereignty of God.

This is confirmed by the Josephus writings cited earlier. Book 4 chapter 8 paragraph 22:

“Besides those two tithes, which I have already said you are to pay every year, the one for the Levites, the other for the festivals, you are to bring every third year a third tithe to be distributed to those that want; to women also that are widows, and to children that are orphans. But as to the ripe fruits, let them carry that which is ripe first of all into the temple; and when they have blessed God for that land which bare them, and which he had given them for a possession, [this is the blessing quoted in the scripture above] when they have also offered those sacrifices which the law has commanded them to bring, let them give the first-fruits to the priests. But when any one hath done this, and hath brought the tithe of all that he hath, together with those first-fruits that are for the Levites, and for the festivals, and when he is about to go home, let him stand before the holy house, and return thanks to God, that he hath delivered them from the injurious treatment they had in Egypt, and hath given them a good land, and a large, and lets them enjoy the fruits thereof; and when he hath openly testified that he hath fully paid the tithes [and other dues] according to the laws of Moses, let him entreat God that he will be ever merciful and gracious to him, and continue so to be to all the Hebrews, both by preserving the good things which he hath already given them, and by adding what it is still in his power to bestow upon them” (emphasis mine).

Josephus mentions both first-fruits and tithe during the same event, because they represent different crops or production. You could be tithing your berries, for example, at a time that you are also first-fruiting your wheat crop.
This ritual made tithing a *spiritual* event, calling to remembrance the power, love, and providence of God. This was similar to the way we give thanks before a meal, and very much like modern communion calls to mind the sacrifice of Jesus. It reminded the tither that he was not just dumping his tithed and first-fruit produce down some rat hole for no good reason, but that he was benefitting from this contract just as much or more than the Levites were.

It may be arguable as to whether this was to be done with every single tithe, or just on certain feast days, but either way it is plain to see that these confessions and acknowledgements must be done *at some time*, and *on some kind of regular basis while tithing*. The point is that today's preachers *do not ever require it*, not now, not once a year, not even every three years. They do not even mention it.

For preachers to accept tithe of any kind without this confession incorporated into the practice at some point makes them just as much of a spirit-warped oaf as someone at communion chomping down a plate full of wafers and guzzling a quart of wine, and making no mention at all of Jesus or the purpose of communion. It amounts to taking what should be a spiritual event and denigrating it to an occasion of materialistic gratification for profit of the preacher.

*Just as the Emphasized Bible describes in Jude 1:11–12* “Woe to them! For they have run riotously in the way of Cain, and have abandoned themselves for the sake of gain [it offers them, following] the error of Balaam, and have perished in rebellion [like that] of Korah! These are hidden reefs [elements of danger] in your love feasts, where they boldly feast sumptuously [carousing together in your midst], without scruples providing for themselves [alone]. They are clouds without water, swept along by the winds; trees, without fruit at the late autumn gathering time--twice (doubly) dead, [lifeless and] plucked up by the roots;”

*In other words, these are posers pretending to be Christians for the purpose of whatever materialistic benefit they can gain by playing the game. This certainly includes false preachers and other church officers, elders, etc.*

*That reference to Korah is about a man who wanted to “serve God”, but only under the circumstances that were agreeable to him. Like many modern preachers, Korah tried to change to his liking God’s clearly worded instructions, and he and his followers were obliterated.*

*Additionally, when was the last time your preacher held a tithe collection specifically designated for the poor at all (as mentioned above)? I suppose that*
some do, but I have never personally seen or heard of one. There are collections for the poor and missions to help Third World countries, but are they done as a tug-your-heartstrings freewill offering campaign, or specifically the result of a poor tithe collection? If a tithe was done, were these affirmations required as well?

Let’s look at another inconvenient instruction, and read Numbers 15:17-21
“And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye come into the land whither I bring you,

Then it shall be, that, when ye eat of the bread of the land, ye shall offer up an heave offering unto the LORD. Ye shall offer up a cake of the first of your dough for an heave offering: as ye do the heave offering of the threshing floor, so shall ye heave it.

Of the first of your dough ye shall give unto the LORD an heave offering in your generations.”

This is what scripture refers to when it says “the first fruits of your dough” (Nehemiah 10:37, Ezekiel 44:30), and highlights yet another example of the hypocrisy of the first-fruit-as-money proponents. If they are so concerned about you supposedly following the Law by tithing cash to them, then why are they not threatening you with God’s curse for not bringing little bread loaves or handfuls of dough to them? These first-fruit/tithe-takers seem to love getting lots of “dough”, but I guess bread dough is not what they have in mind.

Where is Your Contract, Tither?

God obviously differentiates between the tithing and first fruits, since He has dictated two separate confessions for the two separate events. However, somehow God forgot to put a confession in there for “first fruit tithes”.

Verbal acknowledgements accompanied offerings and tithes. Freewill offerings are not tithe, as certain preachers often indicate. These offerings were usually but not always small symbolic quantities, and the ritual was meant to keep people in remembrance of their dependence on God's good grace; His sovereignty. This affirmation was a renewal of the contract with God.

So if you’ve been tithing without verbalizing this affirmation, where is the renewal of your contract with God? Where is your benefit? It is nowhere. You just gave some poser your money and got nothing for it but a religious stage show.
Numbers 31:50-52 talks about a heave offering (not a tithe) of, not 10%; not a token amount; but of all the gold taken as booty in that event. This was done to acknowledge God’s miraculous protection in battle. So an offering can be any amount, up to 100%, but first fruits offerings are token, symbolic amounts, or in the case of livestock it is the first male born.

So to review: it is apparent that you honor and acknowledge the sovereignty of God by the things that you do willingly, consciously, and/or verbally which are in accordance with His Law; not by doing something like tithing, which is actually a business transaction that someone convinced you into thinking you are obligated to do.

In 1Corinthians Paul said “the Law is good, if it is used lawfully”, and so it is. But I guess that these preachers already know the Law, and how unlawfully they are using it since they claim to be “Law teachers”, and we can hold them to the “greater condemnation” of James 3:1 for imposing an unlawful law.

Romans 7:14 "For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin."

This confession of faith that is made while presenting tithes and first-fruits is an example of the spirituality of the Law that Paul is talking about.

This information provided here may be new to you, but it is all imputed knowledge to the preachers. That means that if they hold themselves up to be some kind of authority on the scriptures and expect compensation for their services, then they already know or should have known the plainly worded scriptures that I am presenting here for you today.

If I can find it with occasional scripture reading, then they have also seen it many times as self-proclaimed full-time Bible scholars.

"We Just Want the Money"

Let me ask you – if these preachers are so very, very, very, very concerned about “acknowledging the sovereignty of God” as they so emphatically say they are, then why do they not insist that every tither/first-fruiter must recite
these confessions as would be required by the Law in Deut 26, along with the
transference of their tithe? The main purpose of this Law is to acknowledge the
sovereignty and providence of God. This is, again, just as communion regularly
recalls the sacrifice and salvation of Christ.

Why are these preachers only concerned about getting the money itself when
they should know that back in the era of tithing, the instructions of
Deuteronomy 26 was required not optional?

In my opinion based on personal long-term observation, the reason preachers
do not require these scripturally mandated confessions, and the reason they do
not want your bread loaves or lambs is because they do not care about obeying
the Law or about acknowledging God’s sovereignty, one tenth as much as they
would like you to believe they do.

I mean, they preach for umpteen years, with the implication that they are a
Bible scholar and teacher, some even claiming to be prophets; yet never touch
on a scripture as important and beneficial as Deut 26:13-19 seems to be. How
do they justify their selective Law preaching and enforcement which just
happens to coincide with their achieving the most profit for the least effort?

These preachers get their first fruit tithe term by perverting Deuteronomy
26, so you know they have read this Law; in fact I have heard them read right
through and around these instructions without an accurate comment as to their
significance. The instructions for these confessions are right there plain as day,
so they cannot claim that they did not see it. I see it, and I am just an
amateur. Somehow those who present themselves as anointed-of-God full time
Bible experts seem to have missed it completely. They obviously just plain want
the money, and do not want to deal with all that time consuming rubbish in God’s
Word that is not so lucrative. It is as simple as that.

Keep this scripture in mind the next time the preacher does the hypocrite’s
song-and-dance about how you are somehow guilty of denying God’s sovereignty
as Creator and King every time you choose not to pay a tenth of your income to
him.
Chapter 10
“All the Tithe of Israel”

Preachers will paraphrase Leviticus 27:30 and declare “All the tithe of Israel is mine, sayeth the Lord”. They then use that as a platform from which any number of tithe routines can be launched.

That scripture actually says “And all the tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the land, or of the fruit of the tree, is the LORD’s: it is holy unto the LORD.”

This statement like others made at a time when the tithe was still valid, has nothing to do with proving that a tithe is valid today. The tithe would be God’s, if it existed today, but by His own Word the tithe is obsolete because it is no longer needed.

It is like arguing about who gets to drive your old ’69 Mustang, twenty years after it’s been junked and crushed. It is all irrelevant because it is all history.

This term, “all the tithe of Israel”, like the “Abraham kept my Law” verse is a general statement of scripture which is abused by pro-tithers to mean whatever they want it to say; exploiting the fact that it contains the word “tithe”. Once again, they are making God’s Word to none effect when they do this, but it is such a good, usable and marketable phrase that they cannot resist putting it out there with more spin than a Frisbee.

Apparently, if repeated often enough and loud enough like any other advertising jingle, this term supposedly makes it self-evident that the tithe is still valid, and that it justifies the doctrine that a tithe on all profit and increase worked for and earned by others, is due to the preacher. This includes your income from whatever source, be it labor, inheritance, capital gains (even false capital gains based on inflation) - anything. This is the opposite of what this scripture says regarding a “tithe of the ground”.

We also find that the pro-tithers use this verse as a bait-and-switch tactic where they lay claim to this wealth for themselves, instead of for the Levites as God intended when He made that statement.

If the tithe is God’s, as that scripture says, then what are the preachers doing by copping it? This scripture, if anything, is actually an anti-tithe condemnation of the pro-tithe preachers as apparent God-robbers.
Here is Leviticus 27:28-32 in context. “Notwithstanding no devoted thing, that a man shall devote unto the LORD of all that he hath, both of man and beast, and of the field of his possession, shall be sold or redeemed: every devoted thing is most holy unto the LORD. [“Devoted things” is that which is set aside and reserved to give to the Levites or priests, whether it is for tithes, offerings, gifts, first fruits, or payment of vows.] None devoted, which shall be devoted of men, shall be redeemed; but shall surely be put to death.

And all the tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the land, or of the fruit of the tree, is the LORD’s: it is holy unto the LORD. And if a man will at all redeem ought of his tithes, he shall add thereto the fifth part thereof.

And concerning the tithe of the herd, or of the flock, even of whatsoever passeth under the rod, the tenth shall be holy unto the LORD.

Again, it is food that is the subject matter.

This is an admonition that once something is dedicated to God, it is His at that point, not when the tithed items were actually delivered to the Levites. Since some of these items could have been set aside weeks ahead of time, it is a warning that they should not get any ideas about changing their minds and backing out of the deal. If anyone did come up with excuses for doing so, then fine - they could buy back their tithe, but know that there was a twenty percent penalty waiting for them as well.

Conversely, offerings, first fruits, vows, and other non-tithe obligations had no buy-back option at all. That is why Jephtah (Judges 11:30) paid such a tragic price for his rash vow.

Leviticus 27:28-32 is strictly an enforcement clause to make sure people carried through on their pledges and other obligations, and verifies what I have said so far about the nature of Old Covenant tithing. It has nothing to do with paying a cash tribute to preachers today.

“Holy unto the Lord” means that it goes exactly where it is designated to go as per God’s specific instructions. Since it does morally and literally belong to God, He can designate whatever He wants to be done with it. He specifically states that the tithe was to go to the Levites and the offerings go to the priests who were Aaron’s descendents who were a sub-set of the Levites.
God apparently forgot to include today’s preachers in those instructions.

Numbers 18:24–26 “But the tithes of the children of Israel, which they offer as a heave offering unto the LORD, I have given to the Levites to inherit: therefore I have said unto them, Among the children of Israel they shall have no inheritance.

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Thus speak unto the Levites, and say unto them, When ye take of the children of Israel the tithes which I have given you from them for your inheritance, then ye shall offer up an heave offering of it for the LORD, even a tenth part of the tithe.”

This tenth part was the cream of the first tithe, the best quality food, and this went to the Aaronite priests.

He also reserved the offerings to the sons of Aaron, the priests, in Numbers 18:8 “And the LORD spake unto Aaron, Behold, I also have given thee the charge of mine heave offerings of all the hallowed things of the children of Israel; unto thee have I given them by reason of the anointing, and to thy sons, by an ordinance for ever.”

He then goes on to itemize in detail that the priests get the best of the food, including the fresh ripe first fruits.

You can see already see how preachers have taken Leviticus 27:30 “All the tithe of Israel is Mine, sayeth the Lord” out of context in order to exploit it to promote their doctrine. However, they do so without ever adequately explaining where God states that any alleged New Covenant preacher is entitled to a piece of the tithe/offering pie that was specifically contracted to one exclusive family line in the Old Covenant.

The tithe is inexorably tied to the Levites. So any phraseology where God invokes a sense of possession of the tithe, is done so with the understanding that the tithe should go where His instructions say it should go. This also applies to the “robbing God” statements of Malachi that you may have heard, and that preachers misuse to their own benefit.

Leviticus 27:30 is abused by people who are normally adept when they want to be, at matching two or more scriptures to support or clarify each other. These preachers suddenly become inept when money is involved and can not seem to connect Leviticus 27:30 which defines what is to be tithed (“All the tithe of the land, of the seed of the land or of the fruit of the tree is the Lord’s; it is holy to the Lord”) with Numbers 18:21 which specifies exactly who is entitled to receive tithe (“And
behold, I have given all the tithe in Israel to the sons of Levi as an inheritance in return for their service..."

Now ask yourself: Does “all” mean “all” in that last verse? Unlike Jacob's vow, mentioned earlier, the context in this case indicates that "all" really does mean "all", because the “all” is defined in the statement as being limited by the context to “the tithe of Israel".

Does “sons of Levi” mean “sons of Levi”? Yes it does. It is the physical bloodline of Levi, if God's clearly expressed words mean anything at all. This arrangement specifically excluded everyone but Levites. Are today's preachers genetic descendents of Levi?

If you still believe that the law instructs us to tithe today, you have to find a genuine certifiable Levite to give the tithe to, or else you are failing to obey God's instructions, and guess what? The tribe of Levi no longer identifiably exists.

Numbers 3:9-10  “And thou shalt give the Levites unto Aaron and to his sons: they are wholly given unto him out of the children of Israel.

And thou shalt appoint Aaron and his sons, and they shall wait on their priest’s office: and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death.

Numbers 18:6-7  “And I, behold, I have taken your brethren the Levites from among the children of Israel: to you they are given as a gift for the LORD, to do the service of the tabernacle of the congregation.

Therefore thou and thy sons with thee shall keep your priest’s office for everything of the altar, and within the vail; and ye shall serve: I have given your priest’s office unto you as a service of gift: and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death.

and again in Numbers 18:21-24  “And, behold, I have given the children of Levi all the tenth in Israel for an inheritance, for their service which they serve, even the service of the tabernacle of the congregation.

Neither must the children of Israel henceforth come nigh the tabernacle of the congregation, lest they bear sin, and die.

But the Levites shall do the service of the tabernacle of the congregation, and they shall bear their iniquity: it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations, that among the children of Israel they have no inheritance.
But the tithes of the children of Israel, which they offer as an heave offering unto the LORD, I have given to the Levites to inherit: therefore I have said unto them, Among the children of Israel they shall have no inheritance."

These scriptures state plainly that any outsider who tries to assume the position of priest; either performing the duties, or, by extension accepting the benefit of tithe, is worthy of death; death for impersonating a Levite or priest. Do you think that maybe God was serious about dealing with these impostors?

Though the translation is messed up in the KJV, Numbers 18:31-32 specifically exempts the Levites from being punished with death for partaking of tithed food, as long as they in turn heaved the best of the tithe to the priests.

The American Standard for example, makes these verses more understandable: “And ye shall eat it in every place, ye and your households: for it is your reward in return for your service in the tent of meeting. And ye shall bear no sin by reason of it, when ye have heaved from it the best thereof [to the priests]: and ye shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel, that ye die not.”

This extra reassurance was necessary because there was no messing around with this Law; unauthorized consumption of tithed items, like unauthorized presence at the altar, was punished by death. The Levites apparently were not too keen on suffering this fate due to misunderstanding or inadvertence.

This penalty is on par with the penalty for murder, rape, and sodomy. I do not hear our pro-tithe “seers”, “prophets” or “teachers of God’s Law” expounding on this law of infringing on the Levitical contract. Of course they can’t, because by doing so it would be obvious that they would be accurately condemning themselves to the same penalty as other criminals, because anyone claiming a right to receive tithe is breaking the Law of Numbers 18 every day.

These scriptures alone should end the tithe question, since the Levitical special standing is long gone, with no replacement provided.

This information is so clear and unambiguous, that it should also call into question the competence or integrity of any preacher who ignores scripture like this in order to promote the tithe for the illicit purpose of personal financial gain.

(Fraudulent intent aside, financial gain made from preaching God’s Word, even for honest preaching, is what 1Peter 5:2 refers to as “filthy lucre”.)
This selective preaching behavior also exposes an element of *insincerity* in these pro-tithe, Law-teaching preachers.

I mean, if you *really believed* that your car would blow up when you turned the ignition key, would you get in the car with your children and turn on the ignition key? No, of course not, we would do *anything but* turn that key. However we do get into our cars everyday and start them because we do not believe the car will explode into flames. In most cases that is the farthest thing from our minds.

Likewise with preachers who routinely break God’s capital Laws. If they *really believed* that the Bible is the Word of God and that the words are true, who in their right mind would risk offending God to a point deserving of death just for lousy money? It is a *lot of money*, I will grant you that, but still… who would risk death, unless they did not really believe the warnings in the very Bible that they preach out of?

1John 2:34 “And hereby we do know that we know Him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know Him, and keepeth not His commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.”

The next time you hear some preacher proclaiming "All the tithe of Israel is mine, sayeth the Lord!" the question to ask him is "Then why should we give any of it to you?"
Chapter 11
God Robbers

Malachi warned someone not to “rob God”. (Malachi 3:8)

Malachi was written at a time when the tithe still applied to Israel, and therefore should not be considered as being very relevant one way or the other to the discussion of whether or not the tithe is applicable today.

However, since the Book of Malachi is practically the missal of the pro-tithe doctrine, being by far their single most quoted source, I am including it in our discussion.

When the book of Malachi is brought up, what phrase comes to mind more than "God robber"? This guilt-throwing and accusatory term is the ace up the sleeve of nearly every pro-tithe preacher that I have ever heard, and is used very effectively over and over again to stifle questions or dissent on the subject.

A preacher calling someone a “God-robber” is the moral equivalent of the IRS calling you a “tax cheat” for not paying King George’s stamp tax of 1765.

Stick and Stones

It seems common in preaching events that at the beginning of the subject, in the middle of a presentation, or when all else fails, pro tithe preachers inevitably call a non-tither a thief citing Malachi. It is the verbal hand grenade that is supposed to clear their path of any opposition. After all, who wants to think of themselves as a "Godrobber"; or who even wants to admit that someone who is labeled as such may have points worth discussing?

"A preacher calling someone a ‘God-robber’ is the moral equivalent of the IRS calling you a ‘tax cheat’ for not paying King George’s stamp tax of 1765."

It seems a little strange that some people do not like to hear preachers being called liars, deceivers and defrauders, even when evidence for such is abundant; while they do not think twice about preachers calling Christians of the congregation thieves and God-robbers. Mr. R.J.Rushdoony for example has no compunction about calling non-tithers “parasites” with apparently no blowback
from the congregation. Is there a bit of a double standard going on here? Idolatry of preachers, perhaps?

If the preachers are using fraud to live off of the labor and productivity of the congregation, then who is the real parasite? We have often heard a communist handbook quoted as saying “Always call your opponent what you really are”. This tactic, used extensively in politics, appears to be well worn by preachers as well.

*Name-calling* should not be a problem as long as the unflattering names and identifiers are shown to be *factually verifiable descriptions*, and not just applied for the sake of dishonest psychological manipulation. In these cases it is no longer malicious slander but an accurate identifying term, and if those who are so described do not like it, they ought to demonstrate that the label is not true, or change their ways so that they deserve a more favorable term to be described with.

Jesus called the moneychangers “thieves” in Matt 21:13 and Mark 11:17, but who did they steal from, if they were just *doing business*? Their theft came by way of organized deception and coercion - The people were exchanging their street money for “sanctified money” of the same type and denomination but at a higher cost. They were then allowed to offer the sanctified money to the temple. So it is like charging fifty cents for a *sanctified* quarter that is no different than the two quarters that they are being paid with, except for the fact that they call their special quarter “holy” and acceptable for offering.

So the religious establishment was ripping off the people through the deception of a false doctrine called *money changing*, much like the situation with today’s tithe. I would call them fraudsters, but Jesus used the harsher word of “thieves”; in essence *robbers*.

It apparently offended Him greatly that this theft was done in God’s name to people who had a desire to do right by God, and I understand it completely because it is happening everywhere today with the tithe, as well as other money-mooching strategies used by church corporations. People often lament how Christmas, for example, has lost so much of its meaning due to it being exploited and commercialized, but then, what can you expect from a religion industry that itself is based on exploitation and commercialization?
John the Baptist used the word “vipers” and Jesus used the words “fools” and “thieves”. Any softer language would not have gotten the point across. Those who make too big of a deal out of the name calling issue usually just want to cloak themselves and deprive their accuser of a means of identifying who's who with an accurate name or description.

Aside from all that, today's question is not “Would a man rob God?” but more appropriately “Would God have a man rob you?” by tithe fraud and profiteering from Christians' good intentions; a clear violation of the Eight Commandment.

The True Relevance of Malachi

It is obvious that the Book of Malachi is primarily an indictment of the Levitical Priests themselves, not the Israelites as a whole. Incidental mentioning of Judah and Israel are there to illustrate the end result of the priestly corruption and hypocrisy; how the rotten religious leaders spoiled the whole Israel Nation (Ezekiel 34, 44:10-13 for example; same idea in Isaiah 9:16).

This theme is also present in the famous scripture of Hosea 4:6 “My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge”. The rest of that scripture, the part that is rarely heard, bears out the fact the reason for the “lack of knowledge” was because of the preachers: “because thou [the preachers] hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children.”

Malachi 2:7-9 points out: “For the priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the LORD of hosts.

But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law; ye have corrupted the covenant of Levi, saith the LORD of hosts. Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the people, according as ye have not kept my ways, but have been partial in the law.”

“Partial in the Law” means that they pick and choose which parts of the Law they are going to promote, and which they will downplay or ignore; as is done today with numerous doctrines including that of the tithe.

Do you think those corrupt preachers of old said to their followers “to hell with the truth and with this ‘law’ business, we’re going to pursue corruption.”? Of course not; it rarely works that way. The idol worship and self-serving doctrines repugnant to God were presented one way or the other as
righteousness, truth, and virtue, just as many are today. All false religions and dogmas thereof have been inveigled that way, and the tithe doctrine is no different.

As with the priests, Malachi 2:17 also could not be more clear on the condemnation against the Levites in general.

Read the book, it’s only four chapters long. It is an open letter written to Israel, but it is about “ye priests, who have despised My Name” (1:6), and “ye priests” (2:1), “sons of Levi” (3:3). It is obvious throughout the book that there was corruption in the house of God, and though the people of Israel were no saints, it was not necessarily them who were “robbing God”, but the professional religious leaders. This clearly ties in with, for example, 1Samuel 2:12-17 and 29-30.

In fact the scripturally depicted theme of crooked, greedy preachers who are incompetent, malicious, contemptible, hypocritical, etc, runs throughout the Bible so there is no reason to pretend that preachers like this do not exist today, or that your preacher is immune to these characteristics. He may just be better at hiding them, or maybe you just have not looked close enough.

Here are a few anti-preacher scriptures to get you started: Jeremiah 2:8, 6:13, 8:8-10, 23:16; Micah 3:11, 3:5-8; Zephaniah 3:4, Ezekiel 34 the entire chapter is practically non-stop condemnation; Hosea 6:9; Matt 5:20; 7:15; Luke 11:39, 11:44, 12:1, 16:11-12,19:46;John 5:41,44; Romans 1:18; 3John 9-11, Jude 1:11.

There are many more that you will run across. However, for some reason the most condemning scriptures are muddled and obfuscated in the King James translation. For instance Hosea 4:8 in the KJV reads “They eat up the sin of my people, and they set their heart on their iniquity.”

This translation does not make much sense, and could easily be read over without catching the true meaning.

The Jerusalem Bible translates it: “They feed on the sin of my people and are all greedy for their iniquity” which more clearly indicates that the more people sinned the richer the priests got from the penalty offerings. This is much like a government that imports illegal drugs to insure a massive supply, but then
imprisons and confiscates the property of the users of those drugs, labeling them as the criminals.

Back to Malachi - How is it possible, or at least most likely, to “defraud God” (Mal 3:8) of an offering? One way to do the defrauding is by being the one who does the collecting of the offering and then stuffing a handful (or all of it, for that matter) into their pocket before they turn the collection in to the temple or the particular project that it was meant for.

An example is 2Chronicles 24:4-7 “And it came to pass after this, that Joash was minded to repair the house of the LORD. And he gathered together the priests and the Levites, and said to them, Go out unto the cities of Judah, and gather of all Israel money to repair the house of your God from year to year, and see that ye hasten the matter. Howbeit the Levites hastened it not.

And the king called for Jehoiada the chief, and said unto him, Why hast thou not required of the Levites to bring in out of Judah and out of Jerusalem the collection, according to the commandment of Moses the servant of the LORD, and of the congregation of Israel, for the tabernacle of witness?

For the sons of Athaliah, priests that wicked woman, had broken up the house of God; and also all the dedicated things of the house of the LORD did they bestow upon Baalim.”

So, worse than stealing money for their own personal use, these priests looted money that was given with the intent of supporting Yahweh God’s temple, and used it for the opposite purpose of supporting the religious operations for pagan gods.

So in other words: the more money that the people contributed to a good cause, the more that went to support degenerate, demonic, idol worshipping behavior. Leaving the good people to wonder why the morals of society were spiraling downward. Does this sound familiar to you, oh loyal tither/taxpayer?

Another depiction of Levites with sticky fingers is 2Kings 12:4-9.

Malachi 3:8 is emphasized by 3:10 with the statement “bring the whole tithe of Israel…”.

Who was it that was not bringing it? That scripture could be read two ways. Were the people of Israel not bringing it, or was it the Levites who were receiving it and then pilfering and embezzling it into their basement for their own personal gain before it ever got to the storehouse for distribution?
The priestly defrauding also occurred with the animals for sacrifice (Malachi 1:12-14). Even though certain sacrifices required a perfect animal (Leviticus 22:18-25), the average Israelite did not perform the sacrifice, and could not be held responsible for the “pollution of God’s table”, since it was the Levites and priests in all cases who were responsible for inspecting the quality of animals for sacrifice.

The Israelites brought in bad animals because the Levites accepted them. If an Israelite brought a defective animal in to the temple, it was the Levites responsibility to reject it and demand a good one. It is possible that under that culture of corruption that the Israelite people did not even know that the animals were supposed to be perfect, because the Levites never told them. They did not have their own Bibles to read as we have today, and were dependent on teachers to tell them what the Law said.

This arrangement of teacher-dependence was also imposed on people by the Catholic Church during their era of dominance where Bibles were scarce. It also appears to now be a self-imposed condition by Christians today who have access to Bibles but do not seriously and independently read and study them; preferring instead to hear a preacher tell them what scripture says and means, or using a church-approved study plan.

Regarding tithing - the average Israelite tithed every tenth animal as they ran through the chute. In other words, take ‘em as they run, whether it was their favorite, best one, or if it was the skinny runt that hobbled through with a bad leg. These were the instructions of God (Lev 27:32-33).

The Levites, however were to pick only the best, blemish-free animals for their various purposes and as tithe to the temple priests (Num 18:26-32). So it appears Malachi was speaking to the Levitical class only about this problem of imperfect lambs.

God was speaking through Malachi about problems with the Levites of that
time. The old Levitical paradigm is gone now, but since all scripture is for our learning and as an example to us, and since certain people have presumed themselves to be spiritual “leaders”, even “spiritual Levites”, we can take the same principle that Malachi originally identified as being the heart problem of the Levites and apply it to preachers/clergy of any denomination today even though they are not Levites.

If these preachers actually intend to attach to themselves the status of those few honorable and holy prophets, priests, or Levites that we read about in scripture, then they must first overcome the established, predominant negative connotations of their assumed (crooked) “preacher” title, because that is by far the more commonly depicted scriptural example.

This is not done by lip service and self-promotion, but by living an ascetic lifestyle which exhibits the characteristics of non-materialistic selfless devotion displayed by the prophets, Apostles, and disciples. A lifestyle literally of a slave (bond-servant: Romans 1:1, Titus 1:1, 2Peter 1:1, Jude 1:1, James 1:1) living strictly within the conditional bounds set by the Master, Jesus. This non-materialistic self discipline is, for all practical purposes unheard of today in modern preachers.

In Luke 14:33 Jesus said right out that anyone who does not forsake all worldly wealth and possessions cannot be his disciple. So where does that leave today’s wealth-seeking preachers?

These conditional bounds are not meant to cause the bond-servants of Christ to live a life of misery, but rather these terms of service are meant to act as a filter to select only those with a personality and spirit that can find joy and contentment through luxury-less and non-material means. This puts them in a much better position to receive spiritual insight, just as it apparently did with the true prophets of old.

Materialism is to a great extent an acquired condition. It has been said that the contentment achieved in non-materialistic ways is far more profound and permanent than that obtained through materialistic means. This idea is made well known by the Buddhists, and though it also permeates the Scriptures, the concept is not widely known or practiced among Christians of the last hundred years or so.
In the KJV Matt 21:32 says “For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not.” Other translations use the terms “showing the way of righteousness”, and “as a pattern for righteousness”, which has quite a bit more meaning than the KJV would indicate. John was the exemplification of a non-worldly, content-to-own-nothing, man-of-God preacher.

Tie this concept in with Luke 7:24-28 “And when the messengers of John were departed, he began to speak unto the people concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness for to see? A reed shaken with the wind?

But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they which are gorgeously appareled, and live delicately, are in kings’ courts. But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? Yea, I say unto you, and much more than a prophet. This is he, of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.

For I say unto you, Among those that are born of women there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist: but he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he.”

This is a confirmation of the righteous non-materialistic conduct of what “men of God” are really supposed to be. John, like Jesus, Peter, Paul, etc. are role models for us, especially for anyone wishing to assume any position of responsibility. According to the last sentence of that scripture, we are expected to surpass John’s righteousness. So, how do you think we might accomplish that, or even recognize the concept, if we have a materialistic preacher for a guide, role-model, or teacher?

The fact that today’s preachers desire to be paid money (or have corporate expense accounts) so they can be “gorgeously appareled, and live delicately” makes them hirelings by scriptural definition and by default puts them in the negative category of false prophets and fat shepherds because this type of person is more in-tune to carnal and worldly pleasures than they are to Godly insights.

This is the type of person who invents things like the selling of indulgences. You can bet that the only reason paid preachers of any denomination do not sell indulgences today, is because they cannot get away with it. If they are comfortable in breaking the scriptural injunction against financial gain for preaching God’s Word, why would they stop there? Selling the forgiveness of sins is no more unscriptural or fraudulent than preaching for money is.

People like this may be fine to put on the church payroll as an employed salesman of the corporation’s doctrines; in other words a profit generator. They
are unqualified for true scriptural service however, and certainly not necessarily examples for anyone to emulate.

A modern day parallel to that God-robbing situation in Malachi would be, hypothetically, people giving money to a ministry with the pure though naive intention that they are “giving it to God”. The preacher then using the money for personal pleasure, high-end hotels and restaurants, or to install a swimming pool at his house, buy investment property or precious metals, get a nose job or hundred-dollar hair-dos, even private jets, etc., and one way or another justifying in his mind all this as ministry expenses.

The worst part of this example is that many people think that when preachers lavish themselves in luxury in this manner, the money has still indeed “gone to God”, no matter what the preacher has done with it. That is because preachers have used their own self-interest as a guideline in defining for the people what both “God robbing” and what “giving to God” are supposed to mean, and the people apparently do not know the difference.

Partial in the Law

When was the last time your preacher preached Malachi at you because some congregation members were bringing lame sheep to church for the sacrifice? I will guess never.

Of course he never did, because we all know that the sacrifices are obsolete, and what Malachi is talking about there is obsolete for any purpose other than making a point on principle: a principle of condemning self-centered greed, fraud and the disrespect for God’s will. His will at that time was for the tithes of food items on a regular basis to feed the Levites, and for blemish-free sacrifices.

Yet, while Malachi is intermingling the subjects of tithe and the lame sheep for sacrifice in his writing, associating them really, into one subject; your preacher will ignore half of Malachi’s subject matter – the issue of the now obsolete sacrifices - and arbitrarily validate the other half of what Malachi is talking about – the now obsolete tithe, and apply it to today. They selectively

"They selectively focus in on the tithe part of Malachi – because they do not want sheep, lame, perfect, or otherwise; they just want the money."
focus in on the *tithe* part of Malachi – because they *do not want* sheep, lame, perfect, or otherwise; *they just want the money.*

The point is that if your preacher is complaining about your “duty” to be bringing more tithe money to him based on the writings of Malachi; then to be consistent and honest he should also be insisting that you bring him blemish-free sheep as well.

**The Malachi Prophesy**

The Book of Malachi by definition is all prophesy, since it is information coming from God to man through a human messenger. While the vast majority of this book is dealing with corruption issues contemporary to the time that Malachi wrote it, the book does contain a *sub-prophesy* of a future event that at least one preacher has tried to exploit as being a justification for a modern tithe. His theory is about a future-prophesy in Malachi concerning John the Baptist and the coming of Christ. He says this New Covenant prophesy starts at Malachi 3:1 and goes right through to the end of the book. The claim of course, is that verses 3:8-10 dealing with “God-robbers” are included in that New Covenant prophesy, and that therefore “scriptures demand” that the New Covenant tithe is applicable for today.

*Malachi 3:1 states:* “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the LORD, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the LORD of hosts.”

*Skipping down to Malachi 3:8-10 “ Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, Wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse: for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation.*

Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat [*food, not money or anything else*] in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the LORD of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it.

*Though not entirely apparent from the scripture itself, the prophesy spoken of in 3:1-6 is talking about John the Baptist and New Covenant events. That is no secret because, as I had just mentioned two pages back, in Luke 7:27 Jesus plainly told us of John the Baptist: “This is he, of whom it is written, ‘Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee’.”*
This is a word-for-word quote from Malachi 3:1. It is reconfirmed in Matthew 11:10 and also supported by Luke 1:76-77, so there should be no controversy as to who Malachi was talking about or what time period was being described.

The important point to make here is that the future-prophesy of 3:1-6 is a short interjection relating to the topic of corruption which was happening in Malachi’s time. This is quite apparent when throughout the book the past and present tense is used (“ye are departed out of the way”, “ye offer polluted bread”, etc) along with imminent consequences, but then switches gear to a distant future frame of reference (“Behold, I will send my messenger…”). This is not hard to see.

The futuristic vision that Malachi writes about does not include the interjected verses 3:8-10, as the pro-tithe preacher hoped to convince us of because for starters, it returns to the present and past tense of what these Levites have done, and were currently doing, just like we see in the first two chapters.

We all know that prophesy can be difficult to follow due to ambiguity as to who, what, when and where is being described. However the Book of Malachi was told to him in a straightforward manner using a first-person narrative, as though dictating a letter, but it also included the use of a future-prophesy (3:1-6) to drive home a particular point. The distinction between the described future events and the present (at the time of Malachi) admonitions is not difficult to determine, because of how the book is written.

As mentioned, the first two chapters are speaking in the (then) present. I do not know of anyone who would dispute that observation. To make the distinction even easier, the writing style, beginning in the very second verse uses the accusation/question/answer format. An example is 1:7 “[accusation] Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar and ye say, [question] Wherein have we polluted thee? [answer] In that ye say, The table of the LORD is contemptible.”

This format is used right up to the end of Malachi Chapter 2, and clearly sets that discussion apart from the parenthetical prophetic futuristic statements of Chapter 3:1-6 that were interjected.

We can easily see that the discussion turns back to Malachi’s present time with the accusation/question/answer format returning at 3:7 and 3:8 “Will a man
rob God? [accusation] Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, [question] Wherein have we robbed thee? [answer] In tithes and offerings.”

So trying to include this obviously then-current tithe stealing issue into the parenthetically inserted future prophesy, is more than a little ridiculous.

Malachi 3:9-19 goes on to illustrate the benefits for the Levites of Malachi’s time if they heed the message and reform their clepto-parasitic ways.

Then Chapter 4 begins with “For, behold, the day cometh...” indicating a tone of a more distant future event. While the verses of Chapter 4 are somewhat less defined than the earlier prophesy of 3:1-6, it is clear to see that as soon as Malachi reverts to the subject of future events, we see a lot of “shall” references, and he drops the accusation/question/answer format. This makes the futuristic prophesies exceptionally easy to distinguish from the then-current corruption issues that Malachi was dealing with.

Even though there is a New Covenant prophesy in Malachi, it is a non-issue regarding today’s tithe doctrine. The pro-tithers try to attach tithe-related scriptural material into that prophesy which is clearly not meant to be involved with it, in order to attempt to legitimize the idea of a New Covenant tithe.

So then, after thinking about it some readers may wonder why the New Covenant prophesy was even included with Malachi’s upbraiding of the Levites of his time. What is the nexus between self-centered, corrupt religious administrators that Malachi was addressing, and the dawning of the New Covenant by the appearance of John the Baptist?

It looks like one of the reasons that God causes Malachi to insert that particular prophecy, is the same reason that Jesus refers to it in Luke 7:24-28. That is to point out what a real “man of God” looks like.

Basically Malachi is dealing with a nearly hopeless situation, dealing with such entrenched corruption that they were not likely to repent. But as a means of consolation, he says in effect: “oh well, don’t worry, the day is coming when true men of God will make their appearance”, beginning with John the Baptist.

Jesus, likewise felt the need to explain that the religious dandys and hypocrites that the people held in high esteem at that time, were way off base.
Spiritually, and that the ascetic simplicity of John’s life style was a better example for them to follow.

The further meaning and relevance of that prophesy and its New Covenant fulfillment will be covered in Chapter 26, “True Giving to God”.

We really do not need to spend too much more time on dissecting what the Book of Malachi is, when we have plenty of clear evidence that indicates what the Book of Malachi is not.

Pro-tithers have blown Malachi’s writings all out of proportion in respect to its significance as legitimate evidence for a modern tithe. That is because it can be used to such an emotionally provocative advantage. Malachi is, however virtually useless as a factual or logical basis for supporting a modern tithe doctrine.

The writings of Malachi, while valuable for instilling the concepts of integrity, respect for God, and wariness of preachers; are in no way an admonition or instruction for New Covenant Christians today to be paying a cash tithe to anyone.

The Son of Godrobbor

A retreaded version of the old “Godrobbor” cliché, is one preacher’s 8th Commandment so-called argument.

Malachi 3:7 says in part: “Even from the days of your fathers ye are gone away from mine statutes, ["ordinance" in KJV] and have not kept them.” and 3:8 follows up by including “Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me.”

The pro-tithe schpiel goes like this: The tithe-promoting preacher says that the very same word “statutes” (#2706) used in Deuteronomy Chapters 4-6, in reference to the Ten Commandments, is also used in Malachi 3:7. I think we can agree with him so far; it is the same word.

He goes on to say that since Malachi 3:7 is then followed up by a statement about “robbing God” by not tithing, that therefore the tithe is part of the Ten Commandments, because they both use the word “statutes”. Seeing that a “statute” is part of the moral Law of God (by that preacher’s definition), and seeing how “robbing God” is stealing, and the 8th Commandment against stealing is still in effect; this therefore somehow proves that you must pay the
tithe. He says that “thou shalt not fail to tithe” is implied in the 8th Commandment of "Thou shalt not steal", and since the Ten Commandments are still in effect, therefore not tithing equates to stealing.

The circular reasoning makes this accusation meaninglessness; it is almost a joke. Especially since he refers to this point as being something like a silver bullet; a coup-de-grace that should drop any opposing argument dead in its tracks. It is all the more corny in light of the fact that this very same tithe promoter states elsewhere in his series that the tithe is unequivocally an offering, with no penalty provision to enforce it.

Statutes that are legitimately derived from the Ten Commandments have a penalty (often death) authorized to enforce them; non-tithing does not.

Furthermore, the very basis of the preacher's statement that tithing is a “statute” based on his word-play, and thus part of the Ten Commandments, is not true at all.

First off, this preacher who usually refers to a Strong's number when delving into the original languages, in this case never gives the number but keeps referring to the phonetic pronunciation of the word (mic-kwee-quay). Obviously this creates a bit of a barrier (not much, but it is there) to anyone who might want to look into it. Gee, I wonder why; let us find out.

The Hebrew word for “statute” in Malachi 3:7 is Strongs #2706 (khoke, nothing at all like the “mic-kwee-quay” that the preacher keeps using) which in the original Hebrew is used interchangeably in scripture with #2708 (khook-kaw).

A good example of their synonymous nature is Deuteronomy 6:1 and 2 “Now these are the commandments, the statutes,[#2706] and the judgments, which the LORD your God commanded to teach you, that ye might do them in the land whither ye go to possess it:

That thou mightest fear the LORD thy God, to keep all his statutes [#2708] and his commandments, which I command thee, thou, and thy son, and thy son’s son, all the days of thy life; and that thy days may be prolonged.”

Both are general words meaning “an instruction” or “something appointed to be done”. They are translated variously as “statute” or “ordinance” and can be used when referring to subjects that are either of a criminal (permanent moral) or of a religious (temporal ritualistic) nature.
What the preacher does not tell his listeners is that it is not at all uncommon for #2706 (even more so with #2708) to be used regarding instructions and statutes that are clearly no longer in effect. Strong's lists quite a number of them, and here for the sake of time are only three examples:

- Exodus 29:28 dealing with heave offerings for the priests.
- Exodus 30:21 regarding instructions for the priests in washing their hands and feet.
- Leviticus 6:18 and 22 concerning procedure with sacrifices.

So, I don't know what this “mic-kwee-quay” is that the man is talking about, but he is obviously confused, because the Hebrew word used in both Malachi 3:7 and Deuteronomy 4,5, and 6 that the man refers to is #2706 "khoke".

Malachi's use of the word “statute” (“ordinance” in KJV) in a very general way does not permit honest reasoning to identify “not tithing” as the universally understood criminal act of stealing.

Failure to tithe was stealing, when it happened in an era when the religious ordinance of tithing was still in effect. Thus the use of the word “robbing” would have been appropriate at that time, because the people and the Levites of Malachi’s time were bound by a contract to tithe of their agricultural increase. Failure to do so did indeed amount to stealing, but so what? That deal ended over two thousand years ago, and Malachi’s use of the word #2706 “statute” or “ordinance” or “obligation” has absolutely no significance whatsoever in elevating tithes and offerings from their original status of being Levitical religious ordinances.

Unfortunately for those who hold to this pro-tithe faux-argument, in the real world first they have to prove that the tithe is even owed, which is the crux of the whole tithe issue. Only then can anyone call those who do not pay it a "thief". This “8th Commandment” argument is a good example of the fallacies, the “mic-kwee-mouse” kind of research, and the deceptive practices that are inherent to the tithe doctrine. In this case the preacher's alleged base facts are so obviously flawed, and his sophistry is so poorly done that his point does not even make sense.

"Misuse of Malachi 3:10, is the granddaddy example of the "commercialization", or should I say the “marketing” and puffery of the tithe principle."
We could just as easily and much more justifiably call any pro-tithe preacher with bogus arguments like this a thief, responsible to pay back double what he stole (Exodus 22:9), and tithe-takers in general should be held accountable for impersonating a Levite (death penalty). Someone who falsely accuses good Christians of stealing by using this contrived “8th Commandment” argument, are themselves breaking the 9th Commandment and are liable for the penalty that they are bearing a false witness against (Deut. 19:16-19).

We could also identify them as being a false teacher for promoting the tithe through the use of non-facts, and accepting tithe money, which is scripturally-defined God-robbing as well as defrauding. Jesus lists defrauding as a separate crime from regular theft in Mark 10:19. Luke 19:8 indicates that compensation for fraud is four times what was taken. This is twice the penalty for outright theft.

So tell me – is your Law teaching, eighth commandment-waving, tithe-promoting preacher going to pay the congregation back four times what he has taken in tithes, once you have shown him that unjustifiably promoting the tithe amounts to fraud?

These preachers have not established their right to do or be any of what is required to legitimately take tithes, other than repeating Roman Catholic-based traditions of men. Remember – the tithe of the ground goes only to Levites, this is an established fact of scripture until proven otherwise.

The eighth commandment certainly does not do that.

More on Malachi

Malachi 3:10-11 reads: "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be food in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the LORD of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it.

And I will rebuke the devourer for your sakes, and he shall not destroy the fruits of your ground; neither shall your vine cast her fruit before the time in the field, saith the LORD of hosts."

Notice again, that the tithe is food. It is always dealing with food in one form or another; and the food is for the Levites. The blessing is rain ("windows
of heaven" as in Genesis 11:7) and bountiful crops without insect or animal damage. Tithing revolved around agriculture and the land. That is the extent of the promise in Malachi.

Since wealth comes from the ground, and there can be no prosperity in a society that does not first have abundant food. “Open the windows of heaven” infers that, indirectly, there will be the potential for prosperity in all Israel, for both Levites and the Israelite people of any occupation, as also explained in Deuteronomy 28:12 “The LORD shall open unto thee his good treasure, the heaven to give the rain unto thy land in his season, and to bless all the work of thine hand: and thou shalt lend unto many nations, and thou shalt not borrow.”

According to Malachi, the promise of abundance was contingent primarily upon the integrity and honesty of the Levitical priesthood (religious leaders). In other words: corrupt religion equals a cursed society. The crooked Levites apparently were not paying their tithe up to the crooked high priesthood, and in general they all had a contemptuous posture toward their responsibilities to God Himself.

Misuse of Malachi 3:10, is the granddaddy example of the commercialization, or should I say the marketing of the tithe principle to the customer base (this means you). It is often misused as a carrot on a stick, by those who say “See this here... If you give us more money, God will repay you many times over. You can't afford not to tithe!”

This is an unabashed appeal to the base emotion of greed by pro-tithe preachers, but that is understandable because that is apparently the paradigm they are living in personally, if greed is what motivates them, then that is how they relate to their listeners. What else can you expect with a paid preacher? Businesses are there to make money, and church businesses are no different. Almost any businessman is going to look for the most cost-effective and profitable means of plying his trade. Guilt and greed happen to be two of many hot-buttons that are effective short cuts to higher profits in commercial religion.

Tactics like this are destructive to true Christian ideals and faith. For instance you can have one family with a yearly increase that provides for a modest but comfortable living. They have what they need to thrive but not
enough to over-indulge themselves in materialism. They are thankful to God for their good fortune, as per scriptural New Covenant teachings.

Then you have another family under the same financial conditions who tithes who are not so happy because abundance is not quite so apparent owing to the fact that they gave away ten percent of their income. The false expectations of riches are not met, and this leads to anything from subtle disappointment, to a perplexed feeling of guilt for having done something wrong but not knowing what, to an outright disgruntled state for having been cheated by God out of a deal that the preacher said would make them rich.

Two families under initially identical conditions: one happy, and one not so much. Both mindsets are related to their state of contentment or expectation, and to whether or not these conditions are based on scripture, or on man-made materialistically created desires. The unfulfilled false expectations created by the tithe myth may eventually lead to doubt as to the veracity of the rest of God's Word. All because preachers took "I will make you fishers of men", and construed it to mean "snagging some suckers".

Proverbs sheds a different light on the get rich scheme that the pro-tithers create out of Malachi 3:10. Proverbs 22:16 says "He that oppresseth the poor to increase his riches, and he that giveth to the rich, shall surely come to want."

If you are giving money to a preacher with an income higher than yours (which mathematically is any preacher with a tithing congregation of about a dozen or more families), you are violating the principle of this proverb.

Likewise, if you are giving to a well-to-do preacher who is oppressing the poor with get-rich-quick tithe propaganda, this scripture says that you have got another thing coming: You're going to go broke because you have become his partner. Only in this partnership, you get your share of the guilt, but none of the profits. What a deal.

The principle expressed in Amos 5:11-12 and 8:4-7 confirm the above proverb and how God hates those who deceive and exploit the poor.

So, does scripture contradict scripture? Only when it is misinterpreted, mistranslated, or misapplied. However, scripture does frequently contradict man-made doctrines like that of the modern tithe. This verse from Proverbs has
no conflict with Malachi 3:10, when Malachi is read to mean just what it says - rain and abundant harvest.

Paul also had a different message than that of today’s pro-tithers. Paul does not shill for the lottery-type riches that preachers promote using Malachi 3:10 but instead he explains the principle in 2Corinthians 9:5-15 which says, as family number one, mentioned above, demonstrated - that no matter how much you give to those in need, you will always have a sufficient amount of life's necessities left over for yourself and your family to thrive, thus allowing you to continue doing good works.

The pro-tithers coming from their money-oriented world view cannot help but pollute Paul’s meaning; in fact they actually falsely promote Paul’s statements in 2Corinthians as being based on Malachi 10, when they are on two totally different spiritual plains. Malachi was talking primarily to greedy thieving Levites, and Paul was talking to brothers and sisters in Christ who were spiritually far advanced from those who Malachi was addressing.

Paul explains that your "profit" will be the glory given to God, along with the prayers and blessings of the saints that were helped by your gifts (2 Cor 9:12), which confirms Job 29:11-14, “When the ear heard me, then it blessed me; and when the eye saw me, it gave witness to me:

Because I delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless, and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me: and I caused the widow’s heart to sing for joy. I put on righteousness, and it clothed me: my judgment was as a robe and a diadem.”

Proverbs 19:17: “He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the LORD; and that which he hath given will he pay him again.”

Proverbs 22:9: “He that hath a bountiful eye shall be blessed; for he giveth of his bread to the poor.”

Proverbs 28:8: “He that by usury and unjust gain increaseth his substance, he shall gather it for him that will pity the poor.”

There are other scriptures that have a similar message. There is nothing that I have found in scripture along those lines about being blessed for giving to a church or preacher, however.

Prosperity should be a **side effect** of righteous, productive living, and not the motivation for living righteously.
On the other hand, those crooked preachers that Malachi was talking to would not give a rip about glory to God or the blessings of the people because they were materialists who could not grasp the concept that you gain by giving.

Having enough to superabound in good works does not entail the greed associated with having "more money than you know what to do with", as is claimed by many preachers today when they promote tithing based on Malachi 3:10.

It is not hard to see why they would ask “Well... breaking even? Still having enough to get by on? What kind of incentive is that?” They identify with the profit motive, and more particularly – easy money such as tithe, (known as “unjust gain” in Proverbs 28:8, above) that has not been earned by any truly productive activity.

This is an important distinction; motivation is everything. If you give with the intention of helping others, and pleasing God, and do so as anonymously as possible, you are less likely to fall into the trap of greed and the expectation of raking in multiple times what you've given out, as if you were playing some giant slot machine. Prosperity should be a side effect of righteous, productive living, and not the motivation for living righteously.

The promises of agricultural abundance in Malachi 3:10 were appropriate in their time regarding the tithe, because at that time tithing was the right thing to do; today it is not. Those promises are just as applicable in principle today regarding freewill giving, because freewill giving is the right thing to do for today, and has always been. Some call it "karma", some say "what goes around comes around", "you'll reap what you sow", etc. Generosity is supposed to be a hallmark of Christianity, and it sets up a positive spiritual energy, while greed and selfishness set up a negative one.

As James 4:3 explains: “You ask and do not receive, because you ask with wrong motives, so that you may spend it on your pleasures.”

However, there are no guarantees; contrary to preachers’ promises of blue sky if you tithe to them. Keep in mind that in all cases, God will provide or not provide, as He so chooses, whether or not you tithe, freely give, or withhold.
**Ecclesiastes 9:11** - "I returned, and saw under the sun, that the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favour to men of skill; but time and chance happeneth to them all."

This is verified in Romans 9:12-18 "it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger. Even as it is written, Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated.

What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that hath mercy.

For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, For this very purpose did I raise thee up, that I might show in thee my power, and that my name might be published abroad in all the earth. So then he hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will be hardeneth."

Jesus indirectly confirms this concept in Luke 4:25-27 - God can deny us whatever and whenever He wants to; Luke 13:1-5 - bad things happening to average people. The rain falls on the just and the unjust alike (Matt 5:45).

You should do the right thing because it is right; do not cheapen your good deed of giving to those in need with an expectation of an Earthly reward or recognition, because if you do, you may lose on both counts. Don't worry, God is keeping track (Matt 6:4).

**Storehouses**

By the way - where are all those “storehouses” mentioned in Malachi 3:10 that these preachers talk about so much? As we asked in Chapter 1: “Where is your tithe going now, to fund soup kitchens or other charitable projects?”

If most of the collection is not going right back out to help others in need, what makes you think these tithe collecting preachers will help anyone when hard times are upon us? If anything, they will withhold even the 5% that they now currently claim to hand out, due to the uncertainty of the times.

It is not that your preacher probably does not have a storehouse of lots of food, money, and survival supplies; it is just that the storehouse he has created is for him and his family. It is not for you, as is sometimes implied in tithe propaganda. Many preachers consider the “food in mine house” as belonging to the preacher, not some kind of fund for the emergency needs of the congregation members. This would in fact be true in a legitimate tithe paradigm because in reality the true tithe was food and it was for the Levites specifically, not for the rest of society. The trouble with that is that we are
not living in a legitimate tithe paradigm today, so there should be no tithe going to any preacher in the first place.

It would have been a criminal act for any tithed food to be given to a non-Levite, even a needy one. Of course this issue is evaded by the preachers’ false claims to a Levite status, while at the same time they promote the idea that the storehouse created by the tithe is some kind of Community Chest for the needs of the congregation. This is just part of the inconsistent schizophrenia of the pro-tithe sales pitch:

- The non-Levite preachers collect tithe money and keep it for their personal use;
- they claim a Levitical status in doing so;
- they allude to a storehouse for the needs of the people, but only give out a very small percentage of their take to the needy.

According to true tithe Law, the tithe was food that went to a common storehouse to be allotted to Levites as needed; the right to receive it rested solely with documented bloodline Levites. Giving away any of the tithe, even one percent, to a non Levite was expressly forbidden. The poor got some food from a distinctly separate poor tithe, or the generosity from people in general.

I mean, how many precepts of God's Law can they violate in one false doctrine? Is there any aspect at all of the modern tithe paradigm that is not contrary to God’s morality?

You would be wise to put ten percent of your income into creating your own family storehouse as a means to provide for your family and others, as scripture suggests, instead of adhering to this myth of tithing your money to impostor-Levites known as today’s tithe-taking preachers.

1Timothy 5:8 “But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.”

Take heed, people - “Worse than an infidel”, God apparently does not suffer fools gladly.

Malachi Review
The Book of Malachi was quite specific in its scope. It dealt with a particular problem of corruption: greedy religious leaders abusing God's Law, and enriching themselves with substance that was meant for other purposes. In other words: the original God-robbers.

Ironically, it seems that whenever Malachi is preached, the message is always spun for you to "test God... pay your tithe, and serendipity awaits you", when the message should really be "keep a keen eye on the money and the preacher" as Malachi apparently intended it to be, and as Paul confirmed in Romans 16:17-18: “Now I urge you, brethren, keep your eye on those who cause dissensions and hindrances contrary to the teaching which you learned, and turn away from them. For such men are slaves, not of our Lord Christ but of their own appetites; and by their smooth and flattering speech they deceive the hearts of the unsuspecting.”

Eph 4:14 " As a result, we are no longer to be children, tossed here and there by waves and carried about by every wind of doctrine, by the trickery of men, by craftiness in deceitful scheming;"

Hmmm... Sounds like professional speakers, trained in communication, group psychology, rhetoric, etc and who have a goal of a certain unscriptural desired end (like personal profit), not necessarily to discover or preach truth (on this subject, at least) or to “serve God” without serving themselves first. Paul warned us about this more than once.

Just as Jesus' “woe unto you lawyers” statements have remained valid throughout history, so also has Malachi’s indictment of the dishonest professional holy men. A lesson apparently lost on modern Christians. Do not forget, - the "lawyers" that Jesus warned us about were the religious authorities, the “Kingdom Law teachers”, and the preachers of that day. This was all part of the World Order that He was turning “upside down”. 
Chapter 12

The Accountability Shuffle

Related to the previous subject of storehouses, is the lack of preachers’ accountability for money which is given to them. Tithe-taking preachers actually claim that it is none of your business what they do with your tithe money. You are supposed to “trust them” in that they will be putting it to a Godly use.

Those are their terms, and there is nothing scriptural about it. Of course no one is holding a gun to your head, and if you agree to their arrangement then you had better just give them the money, keep your mouth shut, and pretend that you are blessed because of it. That is entirely your choice to do so but it certainly does not qualify as any scriptural definition of “honoring God with your wealth”.

Do you know how much money your preacher is receiving and/or where it goes? If you have a responsibility, or so-called obligation that they claim you have to give them money, then they have an obligation to account for what they do with it. This means detailed accounts for all of it.

You not only have a right, but a responsibility to know where that money goes. To do any less indicates a degree of immaturity, carelessness, and lack of wisdom. Fiscal accountability is part of the stricter judgment that anyone should expect if they intend to live by the sweat and generosity of others, and preachers are no exception.

2 Kings 12:4-11 Tells the story of how King Jehoash gave the priests silver to repair the temple, yet years later the job had not been accomplished. He had to get on their case and in their face about it in order to get the work done that was paid for, otherwise the priests would have pocketed the money for themselves. So that is a scriptural example of how we need to be “right there” supervising money given to preachers and making them accountable.
What's that you say? The pro-tithers never mentioned any of those scriptures on accountability? Let me point out a few:

2Chronicles 31:12-19 is an example of the accountability that I am talking about – the care, responsibility, and documentation of tithed items, and where they went. The tithe did not belong to the Levite who received it. He was instead only a fiduciary of that food until it got to the storehouse where it got registered. From there it was apportioned to the other Levites.

Likewise in New Covenant times. In Acts 4:34-37, the Apostles handled money only as long as it took to distribute it to the needy, because the Apostles knew it was not their money. They could be trusted to keep their fingers out of the till.

The exception was Judas who was dead by this time. He apparently was an illustration of a selfish and unaccountable steward of money that was “given to God”. You would not know it from reading the King James Version of the Bible, but John 12:6 says that Judas was a thief because he pilfered money from the donation box, which he had been entrusted with.

So, why was he called a thief in almost every translation, including updated versions of the KJV? If Judas was a bona-fide Apostle and a preacher, was he not free to help himself to the collection money and spend it as he wished, as many of today’s preachers do? Obviously not; that money had tight restrictions on its use: it was for basic necessities for Jesus and the Apostles, and to benefit others; as supported by John 13:29 for example: “For some of them thought, because Judas had the bag, that Jesus had said unto him, Buy those things that we have need of against the feast; or, that he should give something to the poor”.

Unaccountability

John 3:20-21 “For everyone who does evil hates the light [of exposure to others], and does not come to the light, lest his deeds should be exposed. But he who practices the truth comes to the light, that his deeds may become known as having been wrought of God”.

This idea does not fit well with most tithe-receiving preachers or with certain church boards when it is applied to them. What are they hiding? They sure
seem to prefer the darkness of secrecy when they say something like "just trust me".

When governments are secretive and unaccountable about money like this we call it *corruption*; when tax-exempt charities do it we call it *illegal*; but in the preacher-defined *kingdom* paradigm, it is just business as usual.

In contrast to the modern “trust me” doctrine, in 1Corinthians 16:1-4 Paul explains his hands-off process of collecting donations for the poor. The plan called for having that wealth remain under the care and responsibility of, not Paul, and not Paul’s family members or his buddies; but under the responsibility of men who were trusted and *specifically designated by the givers* of the donations in letters of authorization.

2Corinthians 8 echoes this concept when it talks again about the same or a similar situation of gifts that were collected and to be distributed to the needy. Paul points out the integrity of Titus and another highly esteemed preacher who was elected by the congregation, as being involved in this effort with Paul, and in charge of the distribution. The impeccable character of these men notwithstanding, verses 18-21 describe yet another brother of high character who was also *appointed by the congregations* as a representative to make sure that the donated items were honestly distributed. Verse twenty explains that this was done to keep everything on the up and up, and so no one could make accusations of embezzlement or playing favorites in distribution, etc.

So you have here Paul, Titus, and a *two representatives of the donors* of all the stuff being distributed; four men who, in theory would keep each other honest. Paul calls this the “honorable” way of doing things.

The _honorable_ way of doing things.

Yet today’s preachers, apparently (in their own minds) being much better men than Paul or Titus, thumb their nose at this scriptural example by ignoring it. They even take great offense to the suggestion that they be held accountable for your money because according to them they are beyond reproach, and beside that it is none of your business. So it should not be rocket science for us to figure out that these are people of a *dishonorable* nature, or at least un submissive to scriptural instruction.
Furthermore, 2Corinthians 9:5 tells us that part of these men’s responsibilities was to make sure during the collection that no one felt coerced or pressured in any way to give anything that they were not happy to give; no guilt trips, no hokey promises of getting rich, or warnings of disaster to those who did not give. This is yet another instruction ignored by the hard-sell tithe promoting preachers of today.

Paul said in 1Thess 5:22 to “avoid the appearance of evil”. I have heard this interpreted to mean that: when evil appears, you should flee from it; but that does not seem to be a winning strategy for Christians. Stephen, Peter, Paul and others certainly did not flee from evil. They stood and confronted it.

Instead, it sounds more like Paul is saying that not only should we not do evil, but that we should not even look like we might be doing evil; to not even give anyone a reason to misconstrue what we are doing as being up to no good.

Did Paul and Titus need to be supervised that way with those donations? Judging by their track records obviously not, but they were following the example of Ezra 8:24-34, in which the gold and silver freewill offerings of the people were carefully counted several times before several responsible persons.

Nehemiah 10:38-39 indicates that even though the Levites went out to collect the tithes, one Aaronite priest went along to keep tabs. “And that we should bring the firstfruits of our dough, and our offerings, and the fruit of all manner of trees, of wine and of oil, unto the priests, to the chambers of the house of our God; and the tithes of our ground unto the Levites, that the same Levites might have the tithes in all the cities of our tillage.

And the priest the son of Aaron shall be with the Levites, when the Levites take tithes: and the Levites shall bring up the tithe of the tithes unto the house of our God, to the chambers, into the treasure house.

These scriptures set an example for the honorable way to handle situations involving money or material goods, but again, the “Law teaching” preachers ignore what they do not like.

Without close supervision, you may get something like 2Chronicles 24:7 where the priests were stealing money meant for the restoration of the temple, and using it instead for Baal temples and idols.

This equates exactly to modern preachers who take money that was intended for doing God’s work, and giving it instead to the Baals of luxury living for themselves.
As an equal member of a true Christian congregation, the way the scriptures depict it you would have a right to know details of the comings and goings of money in the common fund that you contributed to. This includes money that you have given to a preacher, church corporation, or any other group that you assume to qualify as “giving to God”.

The Commercial Alternative

On the other hand, as a paying consumer of a chain store religious franchise, or some preacher’s privately owned religion business, which is what we are really living with today in almost all cases, you can ignore everything that I just said; you have no such rights. You are a merely financial asset to that business.

The preacher is the proprietor, CEO, branch manager or owner of the “ministry” that you are giving your money to. As such, church income, profit, and investment accounts are only the preacher’s business, not yours. You are the preacher’s customer in this case; not a shareholder in his enterprise, and you are certainly not a bona fide equal member of a scripturally formed ecclesia.

The difference is similar to the difference between Deuteronomy 12:13-14

"Take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt offerings in every place that thou seest:

But in the place which the LORD shall choose in one of thy tribes, there thou shalt offer thy burnt offerings, and there thou shalt do all that I command thee."

and the very next verse, Deuteronomy 12:15 "Notwithstanding thou mayest kill and eat flesh in all thy gates, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, according to the blessing of the LORD thy God which he hath given thee: the unclean and the clean may eat thereof, as of the roebuck, and as of the hart."

The difference is, that one is a God-ordained time and place for a sanctified event that is in accordance with scripture, and the other is a routine worldly happening that is directed by man when and where it suits his own purposes. Like a back yard cook out.

Unfortunately, because of their commercial nature, most churchgoing experiences conducted by professional preachers fall into the latter category of being an unsanctified, worldly social event, no matter how elaborately they dress it in pomp and a religious façade.

"You are there because you want to be there, he’s there because he is paid to be there."
Where Did the Money Go?

Just like one of those toy wind-up metal mystery boxes that will make a grinding noise when a coin is placed on it, and a creepy hand reaches out and snatches the coin into the box. That is a real life analogy to the church corporations, ministries, and proprietorships that are “black box” business organizations - you put your money in, preaching comes out. You know nothing of the inner workings, but it is such an interesting and emotionally satisfying show that you keep putting the money in to see it perform again and again.

Remember that no matter how much a preacher sucks up to the big money tithers, or ingratiates himself to you and your family, it is all part of his job. You are there because you want to be there, he is there because he is paid to be there.

Let us think about this for a minute: Does your preacher care about saving your soul so much that he is willing to pay you money to come to church, or pay you to follow God’s Law? Does he offer a cash bonus for you to get baptized? Or to pray? Obviously not. In fact these concepts are so absurd that they may have never even occurred to most people.

We know that people are expected to be good, pray, and be baptized for free, and rightly so because it is for their own ultimate benefit. Most people instinctively know in their heart of hearts that like oil and water, spirituality and materialism do not go together well. Bought and paid for prayers have got to be even more useless than an amateur palm reading. Yet paid preachers are as ubiquitous today as paid bus drivers, even though prayers, communion, and preaching that they perform are supposed to be spiritual activities like the others just mentioned.

As the example in Chapter 1 indicates, some preachers are paid far more than you will ever know or might imagine. Certainly more than what their needs would indicate or what scripture allows. Once money is introduced, it becomes only a matter of time between which the preacher grabs the money, and the money grabs the preacher.

Ask to see the books from the past year - income and expenses, and do not forget that green cash usually does not show up on these ledgers. Then see
what he says; whether he is open to the idea, or if his friendly demeanor turns cold.

Also, if you are a member of an incorporated church, ask to see the church charter or articles of incorporation to make sure that there is not a clause in there that makes the members personally responsible for the church corporate debt.

You can either give these entrepreneurs your money, pretend it is going to God, and be on your way; or you can give your money offerings to God and honor Him the way God Himself tells you to do it. Again, we will cover that in detail later.
Chapter 13
Haggai and the tithe

I have heard Haggai preached as a variation of the Malachi curse routine from a couple of religion business owners. One was a self proclaimed “seer”, and the other a “Kingdom Law teacher”; they both falsely associated the situation described in Haggai 1:6 with a failure to pay tithe.

Here is the scripture they use: “Ye have sown much, and bring in little; ye eat, but ye have not enough; ye drink, but ye are not filled with drink; ye clothe you, but there is none warm; and he that earneth wages earneth wages to put it into a bag with holes.”

The assumption - the mental leap that the preachers make for you is that these bad things will happen to you if you do not start tithing your income to the preachers.

First off, the misuse of scripture like this to threaten others with a curse from God, for the purpose of personal enrichment is reminiscent of something a Haitian voodoo “holy man” would do shaking his chicken bones at some ignorant bystander (“Dem gonna be some bad juju on you, mon!... I mean really bad!”).

Secondly, they provide us with a very good example of how this type of person ignores the distinctive lines between the Old Covenant tithe, and various kinds of freewill giving; falsely homogenizing them all into one and the same activity.

Another example is in RJ Rushdoony's article "Tithing and Social Financing" which states the same kind of deception: "...and the man from Baal-shalisha gave his tithe to Elisha and the school of the prophets on his own (2Kings 4:42–44)."

Let’s look at the facts here:

The context of 2Kings is that this was a first fruit offering, not a tithe.

The context of that scripture from Haggai is dealing with voluntary giving to repair God’s house. The people were steeped in a habit of unconscionable self-
interest, while God’s temple lay in shambles. Even though this is an Old Covenant scripture it has nothing to do with a tithe. Not a thing.

This scripture is dealing with materialistic selfishness versus respect and appreciation for God’s providence and instructions through willful giving. Freewill giving is not tithing and tithing is not freewill giving.

These two preachers (who of course are not the only ones) are exploiting the scriptural ignorance of their listeners, and I am not just being flippant with my remarks about the voodoo curse. This sort of self-proclaimed “anointed of God” preacher is playing on exactly the same kind of superstitious fear that a witch doctor would. It is all just a plain old con. A mafia type shake down - “Pay up, buddy, or my boy Yahweh here is gonna have to rough you up…”.

We hear this type of yellow preaching so often that we do not even think twice about it. We do not identify it as deception because we have been conditioned to think that this tithe-taking preacher is on “our side”, almost like family. This tends to dull our critical thinking ability and our gut feeling that normally would alert us to deception.

The tithe was never intended or used for temple building expenses, maintenance costs, or capital expenditures. The second point is the plain fact is that, for the most part, any scriptural record of building, rebuilding, supplies for, or upkeep of God’s temple involved either an effort by the king (government funds), or freewill gifts and volunteerism on the part of the Israelites. There was no tithe involved in these efforts at all - ever. What are they going to do, build the temple out of zucchini and carrots? The true scriptural tithe is food, remember.

I say “for the most part” because God did have a tax designated for temple operations, but it is another commandment that is ignored by tithe promoters.

This tax is in Exodus 30:12-18 and it stipulates a half-sheckel (about a twenty-five cent silver quarter size) per adult, per year. This was a token amount as a ransom which again, acknowledged God’s sovereignty and protection. This is rarely collected today.

"...the tithe has never been intended for anything other than feeding the Levites."
Nehemiah 10:35-39 for example, specifies *tithes and first fruits* for the Levites and priests; but verse 32-33 clearly identifies an agreed upon *separate* simple annual fee of a fifth ounce of silver (not ten percent, and not food items) for the operation and upkeep of the temple. The capital expenses and the support of labor (Levites) are two totally separate facets of temple management costs, and any *qualified* preacher who deals with Old Covenant Law certainly knows it.

Aside from that small tax for daily upkeep, everything else in the way of major repairs was done and paid for by freewill giving which is what Haggai was talking about.

The tithe was *personal compensation* of food to the tribe of Levi, not for anything else like building construction, maintenance or repairs, cd duplicators, radio airtime, or any other overhead expenses. Soliciting tithe money for such things is *fraud*. Soliciting *tithe money for anything* today is fraud because it has no scriptural validity.

As I said earlier, the tithe has never been intended for anything *other than feeding the Levites*. Read the following scriptures:

The building of the original tabernacle in the wilderness was funded by *freewill offerings*, not tithe (Exodus 25:1-9, 35:4-9, 35:21-29, 38:24-25 which is found in the Septuagint at 39:1). In fact the men and women had to be ordered to quit giving when the workmen had more than enough material to finish the work (Exodus 36:2)

The building of God’s temple at Jerusalem was funded with *freewill offerings* (1Chronicles 29:3-9, 17). No tithe involved.

Another example is 1Chronicles 26:26-27 “Which Shelomith and his brethren were over all the treasures of the *dedicated things*, which David the king, and the chief fathers, the captains over thousands and hundreds, and the captains of the host, had dedicated.

Out of the spoils won in battles did they dedicate to maintain the house of the LORD.”

The Septuagint interprets that last phrase as “that the building of the house of God would not be delayed”. Other translations are also to the effect that these votive offerings were earmarked *specifically* for the building, upkeep, or improvement of the temple itself. They apparently had a fund that they were accumulating over the years until they had enough to get the temple project underway. There is no tithe mentioned in 1Chronicles at all.
The restoration of the House of God was funded by freewill offerings of the heads of families (Ezra 2:68-69) and the King of Persia, of all people (Ezra 1:2-7, 7:15-16). The temple was restored in 2Chronicles 24:4-14 with voluntary donations. No tithe here either.

In fact 2Chronicles 24:6 and 24:9 refer to this type of freewill collection as “the command of Moses”, which refers back to the commandments in Exodus 25:1-9 and 35:4-29, which many would consider as part of God’s Law.

Luke 7:5 mentions that one of the centurion’s good works was that he “built a synagogue”. This was not tithe, but another example of freewill giving and the doing of good works for the benefit of others.

Acts 10:30-31 describes an angel telling Cornelius “Cornelius, thy prayer is heard, and thine alms [no mention of tithe] are had in remembrance in the sight of God.”

So even if you ignore the implication that Cornelius was a giver not a tither, and assume that he tithed as well as gave alms, this verse tells us that it was the prayers and almsgiving that God remembered, not any alleged tithing.

Yet these scriptures somehow get “missed” by preachers who apparently have some kind of love affair with the tithe, and want that money to pay for everything from the capital expenses of their church business, to vacations, to blue-ray video players for every seat in their SUV so their grand kids can watch Disney movies on the trip to the mountain retreat. This is all a clear violation of the old tithe law and Biblical ethics.

Worse yet, these scriptures are by verbal legerdemain often misidentified as tithe scriptures because that is the most effective means of swaying anyone to the false belief that the Old Covenant tithe included cash.

Third and finally: Though Haggai 1:6 is unrelated to the tithe in any way, it is an excellent scripture that does provide a very valuable, timeless lesson on the concept of the wages of selfishness, greed, and disrespect toward God’s providence and His instructions. It is true that freewill giving done in a scriptural manner begets blessings. It is too bad that the preachers used this

"Ironically in their deception these preachers shamelessly demonstrated the very concept of covetousness that Haggai is warning against."
valuable scripture in a bait-and-switch manner the way they did, and polluted its true message with this tithe lie. Ironically in their deception these preachers shamelessly demonstrated the very concept of self-serving covetousness and arrogance toward God that Haggai is warning against.

Why do they drag these freewill-related scriptures like Haggai 1:6 into a discussion on the tithe? Because they have to in order to make it look like they have lots of pro-tithe scriptures. A scripture like this is just too juicy and irresistible for them to not abuse in some way for their own purposes.

Apply the concept of humility and appreciation expressed through freewill generosity that Haggai is speaking of, and combine it with the Old and New Covenant scriptural instructions of “giving to God” by giving to your needy brethren; not to church businesses (See Chapter 25 "Tithing is Not "Giving to God"), and you will have an accurate application for today of this very simple, basic subject.
Chapter 14

The tithe applies to all income, not just agricultural.

They can repeat that motto all they want to, but let them show us *the proof* that would verify this patently false claim.

1Thessalonians 5:21 says “Prove all things”. *Prove* all things, people. Prove *all* things. Your preacher’s opinion, no matter how smoothly he presents it, proves *nothing*. My words prove nothing. Prove all things *from scripture*, with your own eyes. That is why I am providing so much scripture here for you, and asking for you to search it for anything, *anything* that contradicts what I have presented, because I have not found it.

Pro tithers chant irresponsible and untrue mantras like “the tithe applies to all income” as a matter of course, then, when challenged, can only produce wishful thinking and double-talk as evidence.

We have already seen that the story of Abraham proves nothing along the lines of validating a modern tithe, and the story of Jacob actually provides enough substance to *disprove* the idea that a common scriptural tithe on increase existed during his lifetime. Numbers 31:27-30 clearly shows that there was no tithe involved in a windfall situation, and the “God owns it all” scripture says nothing about anything other than food for Levites. So what do they have left?

Let us assume for a moment that we are living today, as tithe promoters assert, under an extension of the Mosaic sacrificial law system that validates animal sacrifices and a modern tithe just as it was in the old days. What makes these non-Levite preachers think that the tithe is on anything other than *food items*, as the Law clearly stipulates?

Naturally they have to have some kind of an answer to that question. Let’s look at the pro-tithers’ *big gun scripture* that “proves” their position on this matter:
They present as evidence 2Chronicles 31:5-6, which reads:

"As soon as the command went abroad, the Israelites gave in abundance the first fruits of grain, vintage fruit, oil, honey, and of all the produce of the field; and they brought in abundantly the tithe of everything. The people of Israel and Judah who lived in Judah's cities also brought the tithe of cattle and sheep and of the dedicated things which were consecrated to the Lord their God, and they laid them in heaps."

The pro-tithe story goes like this: since food items are already itemized in verse 5, the "dedicated things" in verse 6 logically must be manufactured items such as sandals, saddles, etc. (I guess food items can't be "things" and they also can't be "dedicated", according to the tithe promoters). Actually, the preacher speculates that these "heaps" included gold and silver. He also asserts that since oil and wine are "man-made items", this then sets a legal precedent that all crafts and workmanship occupations, in fact all income in general from whatever source, was titheable based on this scripture; and by extension still is.

If the preacher read on just a few more verses to his listeners, he would have revealed that these "heaps" all consisted of something edible, not wearable, spendable, or man-made.

2Chronicles 31:9-10 reads: "Then Hezekiah questioned the priests and Levites about the heaps. Azariah the high priest, of the house of Zadok, answered him, ‘Since the people began to bring the offerings into the Lord's house, we have eaten and have plenty left, for the Lord has blessed His people, and what is left is this great store.’"

I see no mention there of clothes, jewelry, swords or cutlery, new chariots, bird feeders, Barbie dolls or any other manufactured thing, to indicate anything other than food items.

The command went "abroad" because the countryside was where the fields and the bulk of agriculture was located. City dwellers may also have had livestock to offer, and they probably had produce of some sort as well, such as gardens and fruit trees, which would be subject to the tithe tax. This contribution period went on for four months, so almost any type of garden vegetables, dates, figs, etc. could have been tithed in these "heaps".
So, as much as pro tithers cross their fingers and click their heels three times and wish and hope that their theory about heaps of gold and silver in verse 6 would be true, and as much as they seem to selectively omit to their advantage certain pertinent scriptures like verse 10 that negates the validity of their assumptions about the modern tithe-on-everything myth, it is kind of hard to "eat" gold or sandals as verse 10 indicates the Israelites would have had to have done. The clear indication here is that these "heaps" were all food items, just as you'd expect under the instructions of Levitical tithe law. It is just as Malachi stated: “food in my storehouse”.

Aside from all that - "dedicated things" is stated as "goats" in the Septuagint. So there is the possibility that the King James and others based on the Masoretic text have the wrong term there altogether.

Additionally, “dedicated things” can refer to anything that is dedicated to God and is earmarked to give to the temple. It could be tithed items, but it could also be gifts, first fruits, payment of vows, or anything that for any other reason is given to the temple or to the Levites. We might get a better understanding of 2Chronicles 31:6 if we put a comma after “tithe of cattle and sheep”, because that would more clearly differentiate the “dedicated things” as a separate class of items.

In either case it is plain to see that food items are the only thing that is identified as tithe in these scriptures to a fair-minded observer. For pro-tithers to state that something else was there in those heaps when scripture says nothing to that effect, is to be adding to the Word of God or going beyond what is written.

As for the manufactured nature of wine or oil, as one preacher asserts - come on… let’s get real about this. These are merely two forms of storage for these produce items. If squeezing grapes into juice, or olives into oil are "manufacturing", or if that makes it a "man made" item as that preacher would like you to believe, then so does threshing and separating the grains of wheat or barley from the chaff and straw, or drying grapes into raisins, or turning cattle into steaks. They are all part of the harvesting, preparation, and preservation process, not manufacturing.
Soybean oil, for another example, to this day is considered an agricultural commodity and not a manufactured item, and rightly so. To assert otherwise as the preacher does, appears to be a somewhat desperate act. It kind of makes a person wonder just how far out on a ledge these people will go to perpetuate a false doctrine like this.

That preacher also makes the claim that, since Levites were a service industry (not agricultural), and they tithed to the high priests, that this again set a precedent for tithing on income from all types of service or labor.

This appears to be another attempt at feigned logic intended to exploit the scriptural ignorance of his followers.

The fact is, that Levites actually did have an agricultural increase; it is just that the increase was given to them. They did not actually grow it themselves but it was considered an agricultural increase nonetheless as if it were from their own harvest.

Scripture clearly explains this fact in Numbers 18:26-28: “Thus speak unto the Levites, and say unto them, When ye take of the children of Israel the tithes which I have given you from them for your inheritance, then ye shall offer up an heave offering of it for the LORD, even a tenth part of the tithe.

And this your heave offering shall be reckoned unto you, as though it were the corn of the threshingfloor, and as the fulness of the winepress.

Thus ye also shall offer an heave offering unto the LORD of all your tithes, which ye receive of the children of Israel; and ye shall give thereof the LORD’s heave offering to Aaron the priest. Out of all your gifts ye shall offer every heave offering of the LORD, of all the best thereof, even the hallowed part thereof out of it.

Therefore thou [Moses] shalt say unto them [Levites], When ye have heaved the best thereof from it, then it shall be counted unto the Levites as the increase of the threshing floor, and as the increase of the winepress.”

After all, this Levitical tithe was in fact a food distribution system to feed the Levites and priests, so why would not the Levites be expected to tithe on their "increase" of agricultural items up to the next level?

The Levites had special privileges and duties that were distinct and different from the rest of Israel. That is just how God set it up - some rules were different for them under that Covenant of the Sacrificial Law. One rule is that they give the best one-tenth of their increase to the Aaronite priests, even
though they did not grow it themselves. These laws were *special instructions* that applied to the Levites (as non-agriculturalists) only, and not to all Israel.

Speaking of special instructions – what about those Aaronic priests at the top of the food chain? They did not tithe at all. Were they some kind of criminals or God-robbers, just because some tithe promoting preacher with the spirit of Korah cannot accept that God had a special deal with them?

God had a special deal for the Cananites too – they were all to be killed. So are we to go and kill everyone that is not one of “us”? No, of course not – that was a special instruction for a specific group of people. Likewise with the Levites – God had special instructions that applied to them only. So what is the big deal?

These nit-picky word-wranglings over God’s *specific* special instructions for Levites are certainly not a precedent, reason, or excuse to cause Christians to submit a tithe to peccant little preachers in the 21st century, any more than the specific special instructions to Hosea to marry a prostitute apply to us in general today (Hosea 1:2-3).
Chapter 15
Prophesy says: “We still have Levites” – They're us, the Preachers.
(Isaiah 66:19-22, Jeremiah 33:14-26)

"Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation."
- 2 Peter 1:20

If you recall, some of my anti-tithe comments are based on the fact that preachers are not Levites, which God stipulates must be the case for them to receive tithe.

In an attempt to counter such assertions, the pro-tithers have turned to prophesy for their answer. The following two scriptures, when read in combination are supposed to show you how today's preachers are really the new Levites, complete with a separate class status and a God-ordained right to a tenth of your income.

Once again, instead of going to God's Law to read God's Law, we have here an example of someone turning scripture every which way but loose in order to find some excuse to obviate that Law; attempting to circumvent and nullify that Law because they do not like it.

Unlike even the few factual restrictions of how they interpret Biblical stories, prophesy affords preachers like this a wide open, virtually unrestricted field of opportunity to abuse scripture with fantastic claims and conclusions.

The two pro-tithe “proof texts” are the following:
Isaiah 66:19-22 “And I will set a sign among them, and I will send those that escape of them unto the nations, to Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow, to Tubal, and Javan, to the isles afar off, that have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory; and they shall declare my
glory among the Gentiles.
And they shall bring all your brethren for an offering unto the LORD out of all nations upon horses, and in chariots, and in litters, and upon mules, and upon swift beasts, to my holy mountain Jerusalem, saith the LORD, as the children of Israel bring an offering in a clean vessel into the house of the LORD. And I will also take of them for priests and for Levites, saith the LORD. For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the LORD, so shall your seed and your name remain.

Jeremiah 33:14-26 “Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah.
In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land.
In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this is the name wherewith she shall be called, The LORD our righteousness.
For thus saith the Lord; David shall never lack a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel;
Neither shall the priests the Levites lack a man before me to offer burnt offerings and kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually.
And the word of the LORD came unto Jeremiah, saying, Thus saith the LORD; If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; Then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers.
As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured: so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites that minister unto me.
Moreover the word of the LORD came to Jeremiah, saying, Considerest thou not what this people have spoken, saying, The two families which the LORD hath chosen, he hath even cast them off? Thus they have despised my people, that they should be no more a nation before them.
Thus saith the LORD; If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; Then will I cast away the seed of Jacob and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy on them.”

Apparently any prophesy that mentions the word “Levite” is in reference to preachers in New Covenant times, according to the tithe promoters. These two scriptures professionally served up with ladles full of emotion-tugging camp, seem to fit the bill just fine.
With enough effort, these scriptures can be made to look like New Covenant prophesies to those with a predisposed desire to believe it, but that is about where it ends.

The income-tithe advocate preachers have proven themselves to be heavily biased toward self-interested misrepresentations which lead to contradictions of clearly worded scripture. So if they have shown that they cannot accurately read God's plainly worded Law and chew bubble gum at the same time, who could lend credence whatsoever to anything they have to say about the more cryptically worded symbolism of any prophecy; these two in particular?

I mean, they want to explain to us the algebra of prophetic scriptures (to use a metaphor) when they cannot even accurately even read the addition and subtraction tables of the Torah.

As an example of a hole in this Swiss cheese theory, Isaiah 66:22 says “so shall your seed and your name remain” (this is after the new heavens and a new Earth), but who’s name is it? The pro-tithers claim that these prophesies refer to them, but I have not heard preaching from anyone named “Levite” lately. There are a lot of jews named “Levi”, “Levitt” and “Cohen” (which means priest), so maybe that is what this preacher is talking about. We are supposed to tithe to some jewish chap with a Levitical sounding name, is that it?

Maybe preaching while wearing Levi jeans qualifies him as a Levite. I don’t know; but it makes as much sense as the preacher’s assertion that these two scriptures are identifying modern preachers as being Levites. Isaiah 66:22 also talks about a seed line, so are these preachers ready to prove their physical Levitical ancestry? If any preacher is going to use this scripture as a basis, then he will need to prove he is part of this seed line that is referred to.

Isaiah 66:21 says “And I will also take of them for priests and for Levites, saith the LORD”.

To me, this sounds like 1Peter 2:9 “But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light” and also Revelation 1:6 “And hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father;”

Both scriptures indicate that all of God’s people who turn to him will hold this position of priest and be able to address the Heavenly Father directly. So then,
what is so significant about that scripture that makes us believe that the local corner preacher is somehow elevated to Levitical status?

The significance, according to the pro-tithe preacher, is that out of the dozens if not hundreds of English Bible translations, he has found only two that have inserted the word “some” into it: “I will also make some of them priests and for Levites...” (and I would bet dollars to donuts that he checked every single English translation that he could get his hands on)

So that makes it what - 2% of all translations have the word “some” in it? That is pretty thin ice. I would even say it is a bogus, desperate assertion.

But OK, out of kindness let us assume that 98% of English translations have it wrong, and that the word “some” really belongs there. Exactly who is this “some” referred to here? Is it perhaps the most devout Christians among us? Is it those who are the most God-seeking, non-materialistic, selfless, knowledgeable and Holy Spirit-filled? Or is there some unknown way that God picks and chooses these certain select individuals that He is supposedly referring to, the way He picked David, and the way Jesus picked the Apostles?

We all know, of course, who that “some” is, according to any tithe-taking preacher who relates this story to you: it is your tithe-taking preachers who God has made “priests and Levites”, that’s who. “Dei gratia preacher” (preacher by the grace of God), according to them. Any Tom, Dick, or Harry who can put on a suit, grab a Bible and hold an audience is now included in that “some” if that is what he says he is.

So, is this an example of scripture speaking to us through these two prophesies, or is it just another example of a preacher violating the integrity of the scriptures with verbal opium smoke for the sake of his own professional and financial self interest?

I mean, you are not going to hear this song and dance put forth by a preacher who says he is not part of that “some” mentioned in that scripture, but that the other preacher down the street is, and therefore everyone should send their money to him because he is the real deal. No, I will guaranty that you will only hear this kind of interpretation from preachers that stand to personally gain from it by claiming that they themselves are one of the few, the proud, the “some” allegedly mentioned in this prophesy.
Interpreting prophesy in a manner that elevates the interpreter is *always* suspect, and with good reason. This idea that Isaiah 66:21 is somehow authorizing certain preachers today to take your tithe money is totally a 100% man-made, self-serving doctrine, created for the sole purpose of elevating and financially benefiting those in the pulpit who present it. Objective common sense should make that obvious.

Here is that quote again from 2Peter which opened this chapter, only this time in a little wider contextual scope of 1:20-2:1: "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction."

This means that Old Covenant prophesy was authentically divinely inspired, and likewise the interpretation of such must be equally so. There is no room for bogus interpretations by false teachers that not only bring disgrace upon themselves, but also defame God’s Word through their nonsense.

These scriptures deserve the respect for what they are, and are not to be used as a basis for promoting anyone’s personal agenda via some alleged private interpretation of those prophesies.

According to 2Peter 1:21, those scriptures are inspired and sanctified by the Holy Spirit. Anyone blaspheming the Spirit with false, inane, fatuous representations of what these prophesies are supposed to mean, is liable to the non-forgiveness stated in Matt12:31 and Luke 12:10. Particularly but not necessarily when done for personal benefit as this pro-tithe preacher is apparently doing.

As if that is not enough, Peter equates false interpreters of prophesy (as well as false teachers in general) with the condemnation deserved by the false prophets of old. I will add my two cents to that and say there is not a dime’s worth of difference between a false prophet, and a false interpreter of a true prophet.

Now, some may say that this passage is only talking about those who deny Christ, but that is not necessarily so. There are many who honor Jesus to no end with their lips but their heart is far from Him (Matt 15:8, Mark 7:6).
In either event, paid prosperous preachers are anathema to God's Word, and tithe promoting preachers in particular are apparently guilty of this as well as the two sins stated above. This is not because they deny Him in a blatant sense; obviously they have to give lip service to loving Christ, His deity, grace, kingship, etc, if they want to claim to be a Christian preacher. They do so in the sense that they ignore and deny much of the substance of the teaching of Jesus Christ, and they do so in spades whenever they profit financially from preaching scripture.

We will cover that in depth a little later in the New Covenant section of this book.

**Getting back to the "prophesy says we're Levites" subject:**

Jeremiah 33:18 which this preacher refers to, says that there shall not lack a "Levite to offer an ascending sacrifice".

How does this apply to us today? If this prophesy is for here and now, and if today's preachers are supposed to be these "Levites" spoken of here (which is total speculation) (more like fantasy), as per the pro-tithe theory, then they are also expected to offer up sacrifices as in the Old Covenant. That is what it clearly says.

Alternatively, if this "ascending sacrifices" term is representative of our New Covenant praise and prayers (Revelation 5:8, 8:3-4, Hebrews 13:15-16 also Psalm 141:2) then what? Do we have to go through these neo-Levite priest-preachers, and pay to get our prayers heard by God? You would have to think so, in order to make this man's strange theory about this prophesy even remotely possible. Once again we see the Catholic Church's DNA all over this doctrine.

It is also interesting to note that Jeremiah 33:14-26 does not even exist in the Septuagint. I do not know what that is all about, but it indicates that some kind of serious doubt exists about the validity of that scripture to begin with.

How does a person answer such an incredible fantasy such as this man has seriously put forth? As one of his main pillars of evidence, I might add.

"...many, many fabricated, false, and often contradictory doctrines could and have been spun from scriptures of prophesy."
Since facts, questions, debate, or dissenting comments are as a matter of course unwelcomed during these prophesy interpretation presentations, many, many fabricated, false, and often contradictory doctrines can and have been spun from these scriptures.

Prophesies are often vague, symbolic, enigmatic and at times self-conflicting to our way of thinking. The success of promoting any theory about them is based largely on the ability of the promoter to ply his craft of convincing an audience of his conclusions, and the willingness of that audience to be convinced that the doctrine put forth is true.

It is called confirmation bias on the part of the audience- a predisposition to either accept or reject information, based on factors regarding the source of the information rather than the facts of the matter itself; factors such as friendship with, or likeability of the speaker; his perceived authority/expertise, or even the way they comb their hair.

In churches, the bias leans heavily in favor of the source (preacher). With other views being barred, it is in essence acceptance by default by those in the congregation who have not studied the scriptures, since it is the best or only explanation of that prophesy that they had heard so far. In short - they trust the preacher, and they believe what they want to believe.

This is also true of the other prophesies that are spun into a web of a pro-tithe dogma, such as Malachi. The pro-tithers attempt to take the special deal that was made with the specifically identified Levites of the past, and transmogrify into a new deal with anyone today who claims to be “called” or “anointed” to preach and take tithe money.

If these Jeremiah/Isaiah scriptures are “New Covenant prophesies” as the pro-tithe preacher says they are, why are there references to “burnt offerings”, “meat offerings” and “sacrifices”? Maybe God had not yet made up his mind how to handle this “New Covenant” business, and at the time thought that these rituals would continue forever. Is that it?

These interpreters pick from prophecy the verbiage that they think they understand, or sadly, that they can manipulate to a conclusion agreeable to their agenda, and they frivolously explain away or ignore altogether the parts that conflict with, or negate their proposition. These are textbook examples of false teachers that Peter was talking about in 2Peter 1:20-2:1 quoted above.
Let’s reason together about this.

We have already looked at Isaiah 66:19-22 a little more realistically than the pro-tithers might want us to, so let us finish up with the other scripture that pro-tithe preachers claim is talking about them: Jeremiah 33:18 “Neither shall the priests the Levites lack a man before me to offer burnt offerings and kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually.”

This is an accurate prophesy, to my knowledge. As long as there were sacrifices, there was always a qualified priest or Levite to perform this duty. Even though the Levites do not exist today, there are “none lacking” to perform the offerings because the offerings do not exist either; that Levitical position was eliminated when the need for the service was eliminated.

So even though Jeremiah’s prophesy is true, it has nothing whatsoever to do with today’s preachers.

The pro-tithers lean heavily on the statements that in effect say that as long as there is night and day there will be a king of David’s bloodline ruling us, and there will be Levites (or preachers, according to them) serving as priests.

I don’t know exactly what these prophesies are talking about, but then I do not pretend to know or even need to know what they mean in order for me to demonstrate what they certainly do not mean. By speaking about burnt offerings and sacrifices in plain language, it is self-evident that these scriptures are not talking about today’s preachers. We do not need a diploma from a very bad wizard to figure that out.

Could it be that the offices of king and priest of Israel is and has been occupied by Jesus himself, and that is another reason why there will “never lack” a descendant of David to sit on the throne, or a priest to offer sacrifices forever?

I would bet there are a dozen other ideas – any or all of them being much more valid than the pro-tither’s profit-enhancing way of interpreting these two scriptures. But then, that is prophesy for you; by its nature it is easy give a quick speculation about, and even easier to spin incredible conclusions from, if that

"Who says the preachers are the Levites, except for certain preachers themselves!"
is your bag to do so. It is, however, usually very difficult to truly interpret and give a practical application to. It should not be trusted to lightweights or novices, particularly dishonest ones. Again, as Peter said: do not mess around with prophesy; unless you are willing to truly pay the price for being wrong.

The flipside of all this is that Jeremiah said “there shall not lack a Levite…”, so we are back to the same question - Who says the preachers are the Levites, except for certain preachers themselves?

Believing anyone at face value, particularly someone taking your money or claiming to be an authority or somehow chosen, is like believing someone who says: “I am not a liar. We know I’m not a liar because we have just established the fact that I don’t lie by my statement that I am not a liar. So you can rest assured that whatever I tell you is true”

The same circular reasoning applies to someone who says they are “serving God”, or “God’s worker”, etc and they certainly would not lie to you because a “man of God” would not lie.

Are the pro-tithers so brilliant that only they can see the purportedly true message of these two scriptures that appear to the rest of us as meaning something else entirely? Is that why they are potentially worth 6-figure incomes? Is it because we need them to allegedly interpret these fantastic mysteries of scripture for us?

Or is this just a bunch of smoke being blown up our nose and out our ears? Are these the “evil surmisings” mentioned in 1Timothy 6:4? “He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that [financial] gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.”

Is it possible that the use of preacher-speak and quasi-Biblical jargon that the preacher has applied to these two scriptures is meant to sound so profound, in-depth, and intelligent, that it kind of loses the listener in a haze of such confusion that instead of calling it nonsense, we all are supposed to just give up on trying to understand it and say “OK, OK, I
believe you – you’re really smart because I never would have figured that out. Here’s my tithe”?

“And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.” (2Timothy 4:4)

“And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.”

“Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned: From which some having swerved have turned aside unto vain jangling; Desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.” (1Timothy 1:5-7)

John 7:18-19 “When a man’s doctrine is his own he is hoping to get honor for himself; but when he is working for the honor of the one who sent him [God], then he is sincere and by no means an impostor. Did not Moses give you the Law? And yet none of you keeps the Law!” (Jerusalem Bible for the sake of clarity)

Would you not say that if pro-tithers have to stretch things this far by using vague, indefinite prophesies, and get this bizarre with their reasoning to try to negate God’s Law and convince you to tithe, they have lost the debate?

Remember: This Isaiah-Jeremiah hypothesis is another foundational point for the pro-tithe position. It is supposed to be their proof that they are entitled (as some kind of neo-Levites) to receive tithes.

If this core doctrine does not hold water, then what else is there upon which they can stake their claim of the having the right to receive tithe money in God’s behalf, in the face of clearly defined Law that says they can not do so?

2Timothy 2:14-15 “Remind them of these things, and solemnly charge them in the presence of God not to wrangle about words, which is useless and leads to the ruin of the hearers. Be diligent to present yourself approved to God as a workman who does not need to be ashamed, accurately handling the word of truth.

Jeremiah 14:14: “Then the LORD said unto me, the prophets prophesy lies in my name: I sent them not, neither have I commanded them, neither spake unto them: they prophesy unto you a false vision and divination, and a thing of nought, and the deceit of their heart.”
Acts 20:29-31 “For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.”

Peter specifically equates these principles taught by Old Covenant examples of false prophets and greedy shepherds as being active and applicable today to modern false teachers. 2Peter 2:1 “But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies…”

This lesson from Peter could be applied not only teachers but also to preachers, fraternities, politicians and governments, unproven “experts” and “authorities” – anyone to whom you shirk your status and responsibilities, and accept as an authority over yourself without a legitimate, beneficial reason. By deferring to preachers as your “authority”, you are placing them somewhere between you and Jesus, and between you and the truth.

Having said all that, let me add that you will not find the inverse of Peter’s statement to be true - you will not find Peter or anyone else in the New Testament stating that your teachers or leaders are in any way a new version of the Levites or prophets in a positive sense, or as having any kind of Levitical rights or authority. That notion was invented by the Roman Catholic Church, and I will document that fact later on, in the chapter called “Rome: The Mother of Today’s Tithe”.

The Big Kibosh

The whole concept of neo-Levites is nonsense, and we can easily put the “big kibosh” on it by reading Hebrews Chapter 7.

7:18 says “For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.”

To paraphrase that in more understandable terms, it says: “The previous deal provided in God's Law, including that with the priests and with the Levites is cancelled because it turned out to be basically useless”
Yet the pro-tithe preachers want to be identified as Levites. Jesus is a high priest of the order of Melchisadek (Heb 7:20-22). Jesus was not a Levite, Melchisadek was not a Levite.

Yet the pro-tithe preachers who claim to follow a “Melchisadek model” claim to be Levites. Does this make any sense at all?

These pro-tithers who claim to be Levites do not seem to believe Hebrews 13:10: “Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines. For it is a good thing that the heart be established with grace; not with meats [from sacrifices], which have not profited them that have been occupied therein. We have an altar, [Jesus] whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle. “

That “altar” that they cannot partake of includes Hebrews 9:11-14 “But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? “

So that sounds like you either partake in the altar of Christ Jesus with all the associated benefits, or you are out of Christ; staying behind in the old system, burning sacrifices and “serving at the tabernacle”, giving and receiving tithe, and other "dead works". Pro-tithe preachers seem to want to have their lox and bagel, and eat it too; particularly this man and his fallacious double-minded hypothesis about being some kind of Levite, yet claiming to be in Christ. Hebrews is an effort to clearly explain that you can not have it both ways.
In fact Hebrews has a lot to say about losing your salvation by not moving forward to take advantage of what has been offered. Chapter 2, verses 2-3 says we will be punished if we neglect our salvation. 3:7 refers to those who want to stay in the old system as being the rebellion. Chapter 4 talks about “not entering into His rest”, etc.

So with the cost so high, why do they cling to this Levite paradigm? Because it is the only way they can even remotely justify the tithe or their so-called right to accept it. The perceived "sure thing" of riches now, trumps the mere possibility of treasures in heaven, I guess, and that is apparently where their priority lies. You could actually say they have sold their souls for a chance to get tithe money.

To be clear: I am not saying we should trash the entire Old Covenant Law, but we certainly do have some rightly dividing to do in order to get our facts straight. While the world is starving for true disciples and workers of God such as those that Christ described, the Levitical priesthood in any way, shape, or form has clearly been decommissioned, and any modern derivative thereof, such as a neo-Levitical, tithe-taking preacher, is without any scriptural validity whatsoever.

Does God's Law Even Exist for these Preachers?

Jesus said to the Pharisees: “You make the Law to no effect through your traditions…”

Whenever you have men in a position from which they act as arbiter and define the Law as it applies to themselves, you are going to have corruption. We see this emblazoned in almost every act of government today, and we see it right here in these convoluted examples of pro-tithe arguments. Make no mistake: modern tithing and paid preachers are creations and traditions of man. They are not the will of God. Not if the words of scripture have any meaning at all.
God’s Law means what it says. If it says “Thou shall not murder”, you know what it means, and you are not going to let a murderer talk his way out of a conviction with bizarre word wrangling from scripture. Particularly from prophesy.

If for example, you let off some child killer just because he quotes Obadiah’s prophecy about flame and stubble, or because he compares himself to King David killing Amalekites, then there is no Law at all. Someone could then talk their way out of any criminal behavior using misapplied scripture, and make the Law just empty words.

Yet there are those preachers who proclaim their “love for God’s Law” who may actually have had at some point in time a few reasonably accurate, beneficial teachings on that Law, but who then for some reason proceed to disrespect that Law and make it to none effect by their sophistic misuse of scripture regarding tithe.

God’s Law says the tithe is food items, and it says for Levites only; but Mr. Preacher says “No, no, no, do you really think that’s what God meant?” or “That was back then. It’s really money now, and you’re really supposed to give it to me… See what it says here in prophesy?”

Who do you think is telling the truth? Plainly worded scripture, or scripture-nullifying preachers who blaspheme the Holy Spirit by abusing such obscurely interpreted scriptures like those last two prophesies as their basis?

Jeremiah 8:8 “How dare you say: We are wise, and we possess the Law of Yahweh? But look how it has been falsified by the lying pen of the scribes!” (Jerusalem Bible for clarity)

De facto Self-condemnation

When I said at the beginning of this chapter “so apparently any prophesy that mentions the word Levite is in reference to preachers in New Covenant times”, I should have said “any favorable prophesy that mentions the word Levite”.

As we briefly touched on in the chapter on Malachi, scriptural history predominantly depicts chronic abuse, greed, and corruption at the Levitical and priestly levels of Israelite society. Not in every case of course, but enough so that preachers seeking a Levitical status and benefits incur instead upon themselves a legacy of scriptural condemnation.

These indictments were not futuristic prophetic predictions, but are the Word of God in real time; identifying what was actually happening at the time of writing. Thus these writings do not harbor the hazards of misinterpretation associated with prophecies that concern future events. They are easily read in a straightforward manner as accurate examples and analogous references for today.

Many scriptures like this can be taken at face value and used to measure today’s preachers, because they are clear cut examples that relate to a certain spirit; a sinful nature that scripture gives us a timeless warning against. A spirit which was not only condemned when it was in the Old Covenant Levites, priests and false prophets, but also as it exists today in preachers who claim to be the modern counterpart to these notorious offices. They might just as well say “I’m a Pharisee, and proud of it”, or “I'm a Baal priest for Jesus", because with a few exceptions Old and New Covenant preachers of various kinds are widely noted in scripture as being bad characters.

2Timothy 3:16-17 “All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.”

Likewise, Peter also specifically equates the principles taught by Old Covenant examples of false prophets and greedy shepherds with New Covenant false teachers. 2Peter 2:1 “But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies...”

I can do no better than Peter when I say that the doctrine of a modern tithe is a damnable heresy.

Another example of scriptural reprehension of crooked preachers is in Isaiah 28:14-15 “Wherefore hear the word of the LORD, ye scornful men, that rule this people which is in Jerusalem.
Because ye have said, We have made a covenant with death, and with hell are we at agreement; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, it shall not come unto us: for we have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves:"

Others are:

Jeremiah 6:13 “For from the least of them even unto the greatest of them every one is given to covetousness; and from the prophet even unto the priest every one dealeth falsely.”

Micah 3:11 “The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money: yet will they lean upon the LORD, and say, Is not the LORD among us? None evil can come upon us.”

Zephaniah 3:4 “Her prophets are light and treacherous persons: her priests have polluted the sanctuary, they have done violence to the law.”

2Kings 12:4-8 Talks about the Levites stealing silver meant to restore the temple. 2Chronicles 24:5-7 elaborates on that situation, stating that these Levites were taking the freewill offerings of money meant for temple repair, and giving it to the Baalim.

Most of the book of Malachi has this same tone as the above scriptures. Ezekiel 34 is one long rebuke of preachers. Numerous other scriptures express this same message, including the words of Jesus. In fact in the story of the good Samaritan, Jesus implied that the preachers are not your “neighbor” by how He depicted their behavior.

Here are a few more: Jeremiah 2:8-12, 8:10, 23:16-18; Micah 3:5-8; Hosea 6:9, Zechariah 11:1-11, Luke 11:39,12:1, 16:11-12,19:46; 3John 9-11. I am sure you will run across others.

These are the kind of scriptures that your preacher is identifying himself (or herself; corruption knows no gender) with when he claims to have a special Levitical status.

If the pro-tithe preachers want to label themselves as “priests”, “Levites”, “shepherds”, etc, then why would not scathing scriptures like these apply to them automatically?

"If the pro-tithe preachers want to identify themselves as “priests”, “Levites”, “shepherds”, etc, then why would not scathing scriptures like these apply to them?"

“Remember: just because you believe what he is telling you, does not mean he is not a false teacher.”
The short answer to that question is: They do; at least in concept. The longer answer is: They do, but the perception is that they do not because preachers do not want anyone to know that these nasty prophesies are pointing the finger at them. Instead they arrange their preaching agenda to associate only the “good scriptures” with themselves as a means of illuminating their character in the reflected light of saintly virtue that the positive scriptures depict.

It is the “I’m not a crook” technique: In the face of numerous scriptures that condemn their practices, position, and Baal priest-like behavior, they have no defense but to paint themselves as being above reproach and as being one of the few exceptions to the scriptural indictment of their profession as a whole. This cloaking device is primarily a diversionary tactic that shifts attention away from themselves by bad-mouthing their peers.

According to them, the bad prophesies and negative scriptures are for those other preachers. You know - the ones with whom your preacher is not in doctrinal agreement, and who therefore are not truth seekers; who are not preaching “Kingdom ideology”; who are not preaching this or that exactly the way your preacher would have them do it. You know... the competition.

Incredibly, they may even refer to these competing preachers as modern “Baal priests” who are in it for the money (just before they themselves pass the collection plate).

Well, how do we know that these “bad” scriptures are not warning us about the likes of the preacher that we happen to be listening to at that moment? The one who is promoting an un-Lawful tithe?

Remember: just because you believe what he is telling you, does not mean he is not a false teacher.

That is the trap: You believe him because he would never lie, and you know he is not lying because you believe him.

Preachers portray themselves in the light of hand-picked favorable scriptures and prophecies from which they hope to benefit themselves. This tick-like attachment to a defunct Levitical legacy is a dual effort that not only achieves free tithe money, but also make the victims feel privileged to give it to them.
It really is quite a remarkable game, and again, built on foundations provided by
the Roman Catholic Church.

Meanwhile they totally ignore or divert to others the condemnation that God
has laid upon that class of religious leaders and their strong heritage of
materialism, corruption, an overdeveloped sense of self-importance, and even of
idolatry; all of which helped cause the “failure” of the Levitical system in the
first place. These are the more pertinent scriptures from which congregations
should make a checklist to assess their own preacher.

To paraphrase a famous quote – “Being a 'man of God' (or substitute 'seer',
'anointed', 'Kingdom Law Teacher', 'prophet', or even 'Christian') is like being a
lady - If you have to keep telling people that that is what you are, you're not.”

As always, it is a here a little, there a little approach (Isaiah 28:13) that
the pro-tithers use, as if scripture is a smorgasbord that they can pick and
choose what they want to put on your plate in order to form the doctrinal meal
that they want others to swallow.

On the other hand, while the various above mentioned Levite-condemning
scriptures identify character traits that we should beware of, they cannot be
used or construed to imbue scriptural authority to modern preachers, because
that would require certain facts to be evident. Facts like scripture actually
telling us that modern preachers have inherited Levitical authority and rights.

Peter clearly associates today’s preachers with the false prophets, but not
with true prophets or as in any way relating to the position of a devout Levite.

Jesus told us that selflessness, service, and humility are the marks of
leadership (Matt 23:11-12, John 22:24-27 etc), he never told us that His
preachers or workers were to be a replacement for the Levites or “like a Levite”
in any way.

Why do these preachers go out on a limb like this to defend the tithe with
these outlandish and indefensible arguments that they cobble together out of
prophesy? It is because they can get away with it, and because these tales are
the best they can come up with.

They get away with it because aggressively presented ignorance can often
seem like expertise in the field of prophesy. Far-fetched stories like this are
usually presented verbally, with all the persuasive techniques applied and done so in a closed setting, without a challenge to the veracity of the preaching.

That is why, when they present these ideas to a crowd they may sound believable to the unwary on the first take, but when explained in plain written form and stripped down to the basic premise of what they are actually saying, their “prophesy says we’re Levites” argument sounds like the Idiocracy that it really is.

Logic tells you that if they had sound, irrefutable (even plausible), plainly stated scriptures that backed up their position, they would use them. They would shove them in the face of anyone who even thought about questioning the tithe. So where are these sound, irrefutable scriptures? I am still waiting to hear the first one.

If there were any legitimate pro-tithe scriptures to be discovered anywhere, tithe advocates would move heaven and earth to find even one. Instead as you can see with this “preachers are Levites” argument, all they have come up with, once again, is an elaborate hatful of nothing.

Almost a Levite: If it Quacks Like a Duck...
(It may be a hunter with a bird call)

The safety net to their “prophesy-ordained-us-as-neo-Levites” high wire act described above, is one in which these preachers draw a very vague line and say that they are not actually Levites, but that, since they do the same job as the Levites did (presumably preaching God’s Word and “teaching the Law”), that they deserve to be tithed to like the Levites were.

"First off, “Levite” is a genetic seed line, not just a job description."

This assertion of theirs is not true at all; it is another self-serving opinion, that is every bit as false as the previous self-aggrandizing representation of themselves. It is so far from the truth that we can not even call it an exaggeration, but an extremely transparent excuse for them to get money that they are not entitled to.
First off, “Levite” is a *genetic seed line*, not just a job description. So any preacher who says “they do the same job as the Levites” is making an irrelevant statement, even if it were true.

**Numbers 18:21-22** “And, behold, I have given the children of Levi all the tenth in Israel for an inheritance, for their service which they serve, even the service of the tabernacle of the congregation. Neither must the children of Israel [non-Levite] henceforth come nigh the tabernacle of the congregation, lest they bear sin, and die.

Today’s preachers can not heist the tithe benefit of that specific covenant **under any circumstances** any more than penguins in sandals can claim to be heirs to the covenant of Abraham’s seed line.

Secondly, the true Levites had a whole roster of duties and responsibilities assigned to them beside the *teaching of God’s Law*. This included lots of physical labor like handling livestock and carcasses, gutting, bleeding, and skinning of sacrificed animals; firing the alter, cleaning out ashes, maintaining the temple, meticulously cleaning the utensils and vessels, and all of the rituals involved, not just one day a week as some might think, but every day (Heberews 10:11) Apparently the work of Levites was physically taxing enough that they were made to semi-retire at age 50 (Numbers 8:25).

They also gave physical exams and prescribed scriptural remedies for various diseases (Lev 13), and performed circumcisions. Do today’s “neo-Levite” preachers do that? Do they arrest, jail, or punish evildoers? Not only do they not do so, but they will preach against anyone else but the government for doing so. Real Levites were battle-ready security forces and reserve warriors (1Chronicles 26:29-32).

These Levitical activities are all *in addition* to the study, teaching, judging and administering, etc.

"For today’s air-conditioned preachers to compare themselves to the work of Levites is every bit as strange as the night watchman at Walmart saying he is a modern Roman praetorian guard."
As far as their claim of teaching the Law goes – well, you are witnessing what they have done when they teach about the tithe. What makes you think that their other teachings are any more accurate? They may be, they may not. If you can not trust them; if they have earned the right to be viewed with suspicion; if you have to research every single thing that they teach, then you might as well save your time and go directly to the source which is the Bible and read it for yourself. That way, you will not have to go through the trouble of un-learning and de-programming yourself of the so-called truth that they taught you, but which later turned out to be a lie.

Personal study of the Bible is a more scriptural, reliable, and productive approach anyway. If you do not feel qualified, that is all the more reason to read it. Believe me, it does not take a lot of study to realize that the teachings of these preachers are wrong at least as often as they are right.

For today’s air-conditioned preachers to compare themselves to the work of Levites is every bit as strange as the night watchman at Walmart saying he is a modern Roman praetorian guard.

It is all an invented self-aggrandizing “I’m entitled”, “I’m a Levite”, “I’m special”, “I’m Napoleon Bonaparte” type of argument that, if it were claimed by anyone other than a preacher, they would be described as full of themselves or a delusional nut; but somehow because it is claimed by the man in the pulpit it is acceptable or worse; sometimes it is actually believed.

Even if we humor these preachers and say that they do indeed serve in some vague capacity a few of the same selected functions as Levites, their claim to a tithe has no basis in objective reality, because Christian preachers are not supposed to be Levites, or Pharisees, or anything else they have imagined themselves to be. Any similarity in certain duties or aspects of job description to these ancient groups is purely incidental.

Jesus changed the payment terms for His workers, if these preachers really are His workers. Most preachers are employees of a church corporation, or
independent entrepreneurs working primarily for themselves, with the façade or secondary purpose being that they are working for Jesus.

For example, these preachers that say they are “doing the work of the Levites” are not even putting the tithe in the storehouse and then distributing it like the Levites did.

In other words: Are all of the pro-tithe preachers pooling the tithe money that they have collected, and then dividing it evenly among preachers like the Levites did with tithed food? No, of course not; they are simply working the angles, and what is given to Preacher X, stays with Preacher X.

This Levite business is just a cover story to mask their corrupted, hireling personal nature. These are welfare capitalists that we are talking about, not socialists or scriptural idealists. They will imitate the Levite status only to the extent that it achieves them free tithe money, and ignore any other Levitical protocols, restrictions, or duties.

More negative implications.

As it is with their “prophesy says that we’re Levites” argument, we could take these preachers who claim to do the same job as the Levites, and very easily make a convincing case that they are actually doing the same job as the “false prophets” (Jeremiah 5:31), “fat shepherds” (Ezekiel Chapter 34 throughout), or “greedy dogs” (Isaiah 56:11) of the Old Covenant; or the “howling impostors” (2Timothy 3:13) or “wolves” (Acts 20:29-31) that Paul speaks of and spent three years warning his people about.

Do not forget that the Levitical priesthood, just like Israelite line of kings was basically a failed system. Not that God failed; it was His People who

"Most preachers today deny Christ as 2Peter 2:1 says, when they deny and ignore these fundamental teachings of Christ."
dropped the ball. The lure of materialistic gain was apparently just too much
to resist for all but the very exceptional persons. Starting with Aaron’s sons
you had villainy. The upright priest like the righteous king was the rare
exception, not the rule. Why should we volunteer to saddle ourselves with the
same Old Covenant type of corrupt authority structure, when the simplicity
and personal responsibility of New Covenant salvation is such a no-brainer?

To conclude this section - These preachers are simply rationalizing away
their tithe fraud when they put forth this argument that “they do the
Levites’ job”. If they really did do even a part of the job that they say they
do, they would be teaching the Law for what it says and not what they want
it to say, and we would not have to have this discussion about a bogus tithe.

Jesus confirmed the standard payment of room and board (basic
necessities) for His workmen as part of a criteria of non-materialism
generally known as the New Covenant higher calling which was actually
modeled after the lifestyle of the true prophets of old. Most preachers
today deny Christ as 2Peter 2:1 says, when they deny and ignore these
fundamental teachings of Christ, which include His austere requirements and
standards for preachers.
Chapter 16
Proving a Negative

This pro-tithe argument goes like this: “The tithe is part of God’s Law, and since the New Testament does not specifically do away with tithing, it therefore is still valid for today.”

They will state that the non-tithers require the New Covenant to reaffirm the tithe is being valid in order for it to still be in effect, and then go on to compare this to how the law against bestiality is not reconfirmed in the New Covenant, and imply that non-tithers are in favor of bestiality. A little slander to help their cause, I guess.

A New Covenant re-affirmation or exemption certainly would be in order to a reasonable person, because the New Covenant (Hebrews) categorically eliminated the whole Levite/temple/sacrifice paradigm. So the sacrifices were eliminated, the veil of the temple was ripped in half, symbolically ending that whole religious program; the temple itself was totally destroyed, and the gold, silver, and bronze utensils and fixtures looted. Along with this process, the Levites' special contract was ended, the Aaronite Priesthood became obsolete, and they assimilated into the rest of the Israelite population.

There was nothing left of that sacrificial system so we do not need the redundancy of a New Covenant statement specifically eliminating the tithe by name. We certainly do however, need an exemption for the tithe if it was not meant to be included in that fundamental change.

(This issue has nothing to do with the totally separate broad-brushing "Law has been done away with" doctrine that is still debated between Christian denominations and sects. That is the doctrine that seeks to minimize or
eliminate all of God's moral code known as "God's Law", not just the sacrificial instructions.)

The New Covenant does not specifically say “the tithe has been eliminated, don't you dare ever pay it” as pro tithers would like to require in order for them to be convinced. But then, neither does scripture specifically annul every detail of the size, shape and wood type of the incense altar (Exodus 30:1-10) or the design and metal type of the wash basins and utensils of the temple. Nor does it say we must scrap the formula for the incense (Exodus 30:35-38), or the size and fabric of the temple veil (Exodus 26:1-14, 31-33), or any other of the many detailed instructions for temple infrastructure stated in Exodus, Leviticus, and elsewhere.

That is because it does not have to.

As stated earlier in A Few Specifics, there are Laws and instructions that are exclusive to a single group of people, notably the Levites. So when Hebrews states words to the effect that the Levites were dismissed from their special status, and that the “veil was rent, top to bottom”; when we are told that the temple would be destroyed and that whole system would collapse into history, we know that the tithe goes right along with them all because it was just another instruction like those about the altar, the wash basins, the veil, and the incense. This is not a difficult concept to understand, unless someone deliberately wants to make it difficult.

I mean, if someone informed you that the Titanic sank to the bottom of the ocean, what kind of idiot would then ask “Did the propeller sink with it?; You need to prove to me that the propeller sank with the Titanic, before I'll accept that it's gone." “Did the coal shovels sink too?”, Did the dance floor sink as well? The news articles never told us that the dance floor sank with the ship, so

"So once again in this “the tithe was not specifically eliminated” premise, we have a very shallow pro-tithe argument that simply has no merit and would not last a full minute in a live debate."
I'm going to believe and preach that we can still dance on the Titanic's dance floor”.

The very foundation of the pro-tithe argument is absurd. When something is generally but definitely stated to be gone or eliminated, you can expect that everything that was attached to it is gone as well unless specifically excepted, such as “The Titanic sank, and all that is left are the lifeboats and a few floating deck chairs”.

So therefore if there are any exceptions to the New Covenant's broad invalidation of the Old Covenant sacrificial system of rituals, temple, Levites, and tithe, then they would indeed need to be stated. This is true particularly in light of the fact that the issue of supporting God's workers is addressed several times in the New Covenant, and in these instances, any idea of a tithe is notably absent. Instead, Christ clearly specified the pay for His workers as being the basic necessities of life.

To be reasonable, we would need a clear statement exempting the tithe from this obsolescence, and to provide instructions as to whom this new tithe should now go, since the Levitical position has been eliminated. Neither of these instructions can be found in any objective reality; nowhere but in the imaginary parallel universe created by hope and change of the pro-tithe crowd.

So once again in this “the tithe was not specifically eliminated” premise, we have a very shallow pro-tithe argument that simply has no merit and would not last a full minute in a live debate. Neither would the similar prevarication that “non-tithers have no arguments other than that the tithe is not mentioned in the New Testament”.

The fact is that the New Covenant bans all teachings that cannot be verified through scripture (i.e. false doctrines).

Colossians 2:8 "See to it that no one takes you captive through philosophy and empty deception, according to the tradition of men, according to the elementary principles of the world, rather than according to Christ."
The tithe doctrine certainly fits every word of that description.
Section Four

New Covenant scriptures regarding the tithe.

There are only a few scriptures that mention the tithe in the New Covenant:

- Hebrews Chapter 7 refers to the tithe in an historical sense as a means of making a point about Jesus being a high priest. This scripture also reminds us of the Levites' role as exclusive tithe recipients, and clarifies the significance and remarkable nature of that meeting of Abraham and Melchizedek.

- Luke 18:12, in which a Pharisee erroneously equates tithe-paying with being righteous, which is actually quite prophetic of what we see throughout the history of the modern tithe.

- Matt 23:23/Luke 11:42 in which Jesus lambasts the Pharisees for their hypocrisy and for prioritizing the tithe over the more spiritual aspects of God's Law (again, just as we see happening today).

Tithe promoters do their best to spin these three examples in a manner that portrays them as being “New Testament” tithe scriptures.

The fact of the matter is that the Pharisees mentioned in the New Covenant were still living under their version of Old Covenant Law, with the temple and sacrifices still in operation, and therefore the tithe and other temple requirements were still current at that time.

The Pharisees were also sacrificing “as they ought to have done”, so should we still sacrifice animals along with our tithe? The fact that they even use the Pharisees as a role model pretty well sums up the whole pro-tithe mentality.

Jesus also told the ten cleansed lepers to go and show themselves to the priest (Luke 17:14). He told another man cleansed of leprosy to do the same
thing (Matt 8:4, Mark 1:44, Luke 5:14), and in addition told him to offer the
gift that Moses commanded, and is detailed in Leviticus 14:2-7 “This shall be the
law of the leper in the day of his cleansing: He shall be brought unto the priest: And the priest
shall go forth out of the camp; and the priest shall look, and, behold, if the plague of leprosy be
healed in the leper;

Then shall the priest command to take for him that is to be cleansed two birds alive and clean,
and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop: And the priest shall command that one of the birds be
killed in an earthen vessel over running water: As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the
cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall dip them and the living bird in the blood
of the bird that was killed over the running water:

And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall
pronounce him clean, and shall let the living bird loose into the open field.”

Because of these multiple New Covenant scriptures, do preachers today insist
that those who overcome illnesses must come to the preacher for a physical
check up? No, of course they do not. Are preachers willing to go through the
above described process every time a congregation member recovers from a
communicable disease? Not on your life.

Well, why don't they, seeing as how they hold Matt 23:23 and Luke 11:42
(they tithed "as they ought to have done") in such high esteem? If Jesus
supposedly approved one Old Covenant instruction about tithing, and one Old
Covenant instruction about going to a priest for a physical exam and ritual, and
if both were addressed to Old Covenant listeners, why is the pro-tithe
scripture held up and constantly referred to as an example to follow, while the
pro-exam scripture is totally ignored? Is this some of that non-existent
preaching bias at work here? That bias that pro-tithe preachers claim is not
created by tithe money?

This is just another example to underscore the absurdity of the tithe
promoter's claim that “We do the same job as the Levites”. That job
description never included deception or biased preaching.
Realistically, Matt 23:23 and Luke 11:42 are merely incidental to the tithe subject and have no real relevance in either proving or disproving the validity of a modern day tithe. These scriptures merely indicate that a tithe still existed under the temple/sacrificial system at the time that Jesus spoke to the Pharisees, just as the Law of a physical exam by a priest existed. Neither is applicable today.

So, there you go, read them for yourself. Those few scriptures are everything that the New Covenant actually has to say about the tithe, or tenth, or anything along those lines.
Section 5

New Covenant scriptures used for Pro-Tithe Tales

We just went through Section 4, and a short description of every New Covenant scripture that legitimately mentions the tithe. While those scriptures do mention the Old Covenant tithe, they in no way support the idea of validating a modern tithe doctrine.

But what the New Covenant actually says about the tithe, and what pro-tithe preachers say it says, are two entirely separate worlds. Since there are next to no New Covenant scriptures on the tithe, and none at all that support a modern tithe, pro-tithers quite literally have to simply make them up. That is not just an off-the-cuff remark, or cheap put-down, but an accurate over-all assessment of the pro-tithe technique, particularly as it pertains to the New Covenant scriptures that they apply to support their cause.

The tithe doctrine is an excellent example of the adage "Every lie requires four more lies to support it."

"Yet, this is exactly what the pro-tithers claim Paul was doing: teaching people to tithe without ever mentioning or describing the act of tithing."

Before we proceed to the next section, let us consider the basic philosophy behind their claim that the New Testament is pro-tithe in nature.

The foundational pretext of the pro-tithe camp is that New Covenant scriptures, the writings of Paul in particular, are instructing us to tithe without ever using the word tithe or tenth or any description thereof.

Stop and think for a moment to realize the full absurdity of their premise.
I mean, how many preachers do you know of who promote the tithe, but who never use the word *tithe* or *tenth* to support their position, as they claim Paul has done?

How many preachers do you know of who would ever try to teach baptism without ever using the words *baptism* or *immersion* or who would never describe the act of immersion in their teachings? Or have you ever heard of someone teaching about the solar system without using the words *sun, moon, planets* or *rotation*?

It is a preposterous thought. If you are teaching a subject, you naturally use the name of your subject and words that describe the subject matter in your teachings; to do anything else would be some kind of bizarre charade or comedy act.

Yet, this is exactly what the pro-tithers claim Paul was doing: teaching people to tithe without ever mentioning or describing the act of tithing.

Keep that observation in mind, and as we did with the Old Covenant, let us address the New Covenant scriptures that tithe advocates claim to support their case. As they say: “let’s see how deep the rabbit hole goes.”
Chapter 17
Type-antitype Theory:
Preachers as the “New Levites”

This is their back-stop to the “prophesy says that we’re Levites” doctrine.
Typology is a theory that certain people, places, and events in the Old
Covenant called types, have a corresponding and greater counterpart in the New
Covenant which are called antitypes. For example the stone temple where God
resided was a type for which the antitype is now the Christian’s human body in
which the Spirit of God now lives; the heart now being the innermost holy of
holies. The type of the sacrifice of animals is now replaced with the antitype of
personal heartfelt repentance, prayer, and submission to God.

There is some Scriptural justification for this idea, but like so many things it
can be carried on to excess or manipulated. For example the type of Christ is
claimed to be, depending on who you talk to, either Adam, Aaron, Melchisedek,
or King David. Like the interpretation of prophesy, typology is a field wide open
to conjecture, error, and abuse, often limited only by the preacher's creativity.

The idea promoted by pro-tithers is that Levites were the type and today's
preachers are the antitype. Some of these preachers then expect us to assume
that agricultural products are the type, and cash, check or credit cards are the
anti-type, all of which being without a stitch of substantiating evidence.

In one of the few statements that actually dealt with the tithe issue and not
red-herring diversions or false accusations, a Nebraska preacher wrote to me
back in 2008: "Your position stands or falls on whether you have adequately
answered Paul's New Covenant application of the temple tithes".

He was referring specifically to 1Corinthians 9:7-14.
In answering that, let me ask you, the reader, a strange question as a means of illustration. Are you ready? Here’s the question:

What was Humpty Dumpty?

Nearly everyone says “an egg”.

My next question is:

How do you know that?

The rhyme indicates nothing of the sort. So then, why do we picture that character as an egg?

This rhyme that is said to originally have had political origins and allusions in the early 1800's, but other information leads to the theory that it originated in the 1600's and was about a huge cannon and not a person at all.

We picture the egg-like character because that is what some illustrator drew, and put in a popular book. Then over the next couple of hundred years others followed suit, and now everyone knows that Mr. Dumpty was an egg, and this assumed knowledge is based on someone else’s opinion, interpretation, or invention of the character.

This is exactly what happens when, instead of reading the Bible for yourself, you listen to a preacher give his interpretation of what the Bible says, and this man’s take on 1 Corinthians 9:7-14 is a case in point.

Let’s read this scripture and see what it says about “temple tithes”:  "Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the same also? For it is written in the law of Moses, thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written: that he that ploweth should plow in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope.

If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? If others be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather? Nevertheless we have not used this power; but suffer all things, lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ.

Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar?

Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel."
Neither “Levite” nor “tithe” is mentioned here, and you can see for yourself that there is no indication of Paul talking about a type or antitype of anything at all, let alone a tithe.

This preacher's use of the term "temple tithes" is very presumptive and misleading; invented would be the more apropriate word, and perhaps concocted is even more accurate. It indicates his pre-concluded state of mind - In other words, a subjective interpretation or even a blindness or delusion. “Temple tithes” is there only because that preacher wants it to be there, because that is how they can convert the term live of the gospel (basic sustenance) into million-dollar businesses.

In fact the term “temple tithe” does not exist anywhere in the KJV, NAS, NIV, or other less known Bible translations including Catholic versions. It is another fanciful invented term. As you may recall, the temple of the Israelites was never given tithes. Tithes went to the Levites only, because tithes were food. What does a building need with food? The temple building and upkeep was always funded by freewill offerings of money, building supplies, and labor. So “temple tithes”, like “first-fruit tithes” is a meaningless, fabricated propagandic term in regard to Israelite or Christian religion. It may have been something that existed in various pagan idolatrous religions, but not in the Christian Bible.

A rule of physics is that: “Any theory that relies more on assumptions than facts, is probably not true.” This applies to many subjects, and the tithe issue is a good example.

This is all readily apparent even while reading the pro tithe preacher's translation of choice, the King James Bible, which obfuscates the meaning of this passage, particularly the last two verses: "Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar?

Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel."

More accurate translations use food-related terms in these verses, such as The Rotherham Bible "Know ye not that they who labour at the holy rites do eat the provisions out of the holy place?" or the NAS "Do you not know that those who perform sacred services eat the food of the temple,..." and even the New King James version has
had to 'fess up to a slightly less muddled translation: "Do you not know that those who minister the holy things eat of the things of the temple,..."

In fact it takes some looking to find a Bible version other than the old KJV to see a translation that does not indicate food or eating.

Rather than go through the various Bible versions, let us just cut through it all and go by Strong's definitions and figure it out for ourselves.

"Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live (The word "live" is Strong's #2068 "eat" in the common sense of the word, like “eat a sandwich”) of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? (the word “altar” automatically implies food of some sort, usually meat)

Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live (#2198, “to live” be alive, exist) of the gospel."

Pro tithers take advantage of the KJV poor translation by equating the first “live”, with our modern term "make a living" or to make money at preaching. Then they tie that thought in with "live of the gospel" to come up with the doctrine of paid preachers whose financial prosperity is limited only by their ability to acquire it.

As we can see, that first word “live” has no business even being there, because it should without doubt be translated as eat or subsist.

1Corinthians 9:7-14 has no financial prosperity connotation to it at all, particularly in light of the verses leading up to it that allude to serving as a soldier ("who goeth a warfare"), or eating grapes or grain, drinking milk, or the analogy to the humblest of laborers, the lowly ox.

So to answer the corn husker’s request - I can not “adequately answer Paul’s application of temple tithes” because such application does not exist. Paul never ‘applied temple tithes’.

That preacher’s little challenge turned out to be yet another red herring - a diversionary prank. He could just as well have said "Your position stands or falls on whether you have adequately answered Peter’s New Covenant application of..."
submarine warfare techniques". It is a non-existent fiction dispersed like squid's ink to distract and confuse the issue.

This preacher inexplicably still uses this “temple tithe” term in relation to this scripture, even after it was pointed out to him the reality that there is no “tithe” mentioned here.

The temple/altar/tithe connection?

Paul was using a pagan temple simply as an analogy, but for the sake of argument let us humor the pro-tithers basic assumption that Paul was using some kind of Hebrew temple as a point of reference to these pagan Greeks in Corinth. We will proceed for the moment, using their assumption as a basis:

There were lots of various non-tithe offerings and sacrifices for workers in any temple to "eat of"; whether it is in Hebrew or pagan society. While performing "service to the temple" is a more general term, "Attending the altar" by definition indicates sacrificed food items or offerings. The sacrifices and offerings were eaten by priests, temple workers, and in some cases by the congregation members as well.

The tithe was only one part of a much bigger picture of Israelite contributions to the temple religious system, so just because there is something on the altar to partake of, does not mean that anyone tithed anything to anyone. In fact it indicates just the opposite; food on the altar was there because of an offering or sacrifice, never a tithe. Never a tithe.

Remember - tithes were given for Levites' private, personal use, never for public sacrifices. Levites did not do their home cooking on God's altar, any more than a surgeon would chop onions for soup on his operating table.

An altar is by definition a place for certain sacred or holy purposes like presenting things to God Almighty; not for the mundane things like cooking tithed oatmeal or grilling tithed hamburgers. So, no matter who was "partaking of the altar" it was certainly not a tithe that they are partaking of, because the tithes went to the storehouse, and from there they were allotted to the Levites to prepare and eat at home, not at any altar. So the preachers' spin on those scriptures alluding to a tithe makes, once again, no sense at all.

Just to cover all the bases - if you are hung up on the term “live of the temple” as having something to do with tithed items - we have already
established that tithes never went to the temple but to Levites. Food for Levites may have been stored in the temple somewhere but it was a segregated account from the temple treasury itself. The treasury would have held money and material gathered from freewill offerings to maintain the temple building and equipment.

Any food to be partaken of that was “of the temple” came from ongoing sacrificial operations. It could be possible, if you would really want to stretch things, to say that Paul meant “eating tithed food” when he said “live of the temple”, but that would have made his choice of words seem very odd. If that was Paul’s meaning, you would expect him to have said “live of the tithes”.

In any case, even if Paul was including a tithe as part of an illustration of a Hebrew temple (which he was not), that would not be a type/antitype teaching by any stretch of the imagination. Paul would have been merely making an analogy to something that his listeners presumably are familiar with, and not be reinstituting a modern tithe by doing so.

If it was Paul’s intent to reinstitute the tithe, as the Nebraska preacher insists is the case, then Paul would also have been reinstituting animal sacrifices as well, because he equates “live of the temple” and “partake of the altar” by tying these two separate aspects together in the same sentence and as part of the same basic activity.

“This is all working under the false assumption that Paul was even referring to a Hebrew temple in these scriptures to begin with.”

“Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar?”

So if the tithe were presumed to be still valid based on this statement (“live of the things of temple”) as pro-tithers say, then the animal sacrifices which were performed on the altar would have been validated right along with it (“partaker with the altar”), and we know that that is not what Paul intended.

This is all working under the false assumption that Paul was even referring to a Hebrew temple in these scriptures to begin with. The facts of scripture indicate quite clearly that he was not.
The fact that Paul merely mentions a temple and altar as an example in 1Corinthians 9 means nothing in regard to a type-antitype theory, despite the overemphasis that pro-tithe propagandists put on it.

Paul may very well have been referring to the Temple of Diana, or some other pagan temple that they were familiar with. This is certainly not unusual. Paul related to pagans on their own terms. He talked to the Athenians about the temple of the "unknown god" in Acts 17, for example.

Paul's use of the term "holy place" is not an issue, since, again, he was relating to these people in their own terms. "Holy" simply means "set aside as special", or "spiritually significant". These pagan sites were holy to them; at least previously, so Paul refers to them as such so they would know what he was talking about.

Sure, the New Covenant does speak of the Israelite altar, but it logically does so in Hebrews 13:10-12 in a letter addressed to Hebrews who are familiar with those religious customs; but not here, where Paul is talking to Greeks living in a pagan culture. What sense would that make?

The pro-tithe presentation of these scriptures would have to assume that Paul was some kind of bumbling fool who could not identify his audience. Or are they attributing this inept foolishness to the Holy Spirit, since these very same preachers will recognize and proclaim that Paul's writings were Holy Spirit inspired?

Paul is writing here to the Corinthians. Were not Corinth and Athens in pagan Greece? What, more likely, would they be more familiar with - the many pagan altars that existed in Greece, or the Hebrew altar in far away Jerusalem? Just one chapter before, 1Corinthians 8:1, Paul states "Now concerning idol-sacrifices we are aware, because we all have knowledge..."

Why do they "all have knowledge"? It is because they were immersed in a pagan society and (except Paul) were probably all former pagans (1Corinthians 12:2). In fact all of the previous chapter, 1Corinthians 8, is about eating of idol-sacrifices. Is it that difficult to imagine that, just a few verses later in chapter 9, Paul would still be referring back to those rituals and the pagan altar, instead of suddenly switching his frame of reference to the Israelite temple and the Levitical tithe which these people would have little or no knowledge of?
Paul referred to these altars as being pagan and of “sacrificing to demons” in 1 Corinthians 10:18-21: “Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar? What say I then? that the idol is anything, or that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is anything? But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils.

Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord’s table, and of the table of devils.”

Does this sound like an altar of Yahweh God to you? It has to, if you swallow the pro-tithe story that Paul is speaking of an altar to the God of Israel in chapter 9.

Just to clarify Paul’s statement: “Israel after the flesh” is talking about these pagan Greeks that Paul was evangelizing. Evidence indicates that these areas were Paul travelled were all settled by the "lost" ten-tribes of Israel.

Why do you think Paul and the elders, writing a letter containing minimal requirements for new Christians, had to include "abstaining from idol sacrifices" (Acts 15:29)? Because that was the *predominating culture* at that time, and had been their culture immediately prior to their conversion to Christianity. They were in a transitional learning period; breaking old habits.

Paul also describes something like the Greek Olympics in 1 Corinthians 10:25. He again uses an illustration from their own culture that they were familiar with.

If Paul related to the Athenians using pagan examples and terms about the “unknown god”; you would expect him to also use cultural examples as reference points with the Corinthians. Paul went directly from Athens to Corinth (Acts 18:1), so why not use the same method of relating to each of them?

Read 1 Corinthians chapters 8 and 9 again, if you need to; and think it through for yourself whether the altar that Paul was talking about to the Corinthians was most likely that of the Israelites in Jerusalem, or if it was one of the pagan altars that were common to Greece.

While you are at it, look for evidence, *any evidence at all* that indicates that Paul was talking about an Israelite altar to Yahweh and linking it to the tithe. You will not find it because it is all one big fat fabrication.
Metaphors – and Real Antitype Examples

We have gone through the scriptures that pro-tithers claim to be type/antitype examples which supposedly justify a modern tithe, so let us look at what real type/antitype scriptures look like.

Paul said in 2Corinthians 1:13 “For we write nothing else to you than what you read and understand, and I hope you will understand until the end.” The Amplified Bible and Jerusalem Bible clarify this verse even more by the words “there are no secret or hidden meanings in what we write”. This fits with how we see Paul explaining things, but it contradicts the pro-tithe assertion that Paul was cryptically talking about the tithe in various passages of Scripture.

Paul said “No secret meanings”. Should we believe Paul, or some preacher that says Paul really meant something other than what he was saying?

Paul, like any good teacher, used metaphors. He mentioned the plowman and thresher as examples, so does that mean that Christians need to also be farmers? He later mentions running a race. Do we all have to be athletes as well? Of course not; these are metaphors and similes – common teaching tools as old as language itself.

Paul points out that he is speaking in allegorical terms, so no one misses the point that he is trying to make. An example is Galatians 4:23-24 “But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Hagar.

In 1Corinthians 10, Paul lists some incidents with the Israelites in the desert after leaving Egypt. In verse 11 Paul clearly states that these were types, and were written for our admonition.

Look at Hebrews 9, the whole chapter. Paul is explaining the type of the old temple and priests, to the antitype of our living temples wherein dwells the Holy Spirit, and to the ultimate Priest, Jesus. These are what legitimate type-antitype scriptures look like, because Paul tells you what they are, which is very much unlike Paul’s metaphorical explanation of “muzzle the ox” in 1Corinthians 9:7-14 which pro-tithers claim is proof of their tithe-receiving entitlement.

By the way, do you see anything even resembling a type/antitype of the tithe in Hebrews 9 where it would have fit in nicely with the other temple type-antitypes? No, sorry, I guess not.
1Corinthians 9:8-11 “Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the same also? For it is written in the law of Moses, thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? Or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written: that he that ploweth should plow in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope.

If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?”

Those who may think this "muzzle the ox" statement is a type/antitype for modern tithing are missing the obvious: If it really was a type/antitype reference of any kind, the ox would have been the type, and human labor (of any sort) the antitype. It is right there as plain as can be, and Paul explains the metaphor as such. How much more clearly could he have explained it? There is no indication of tithing or Levites here at all.

Levites were a higher class of Israelite society just below priests and royalty, with no analogies anywhere in scripture equating them with the lowest servants on the totem pole: the brutish, hardworking ox. I mean, how many farmers have ever given one tenth of their income to their ox? It is a ridiculous concept and a totally inappropriate analogy.

On the other hand, when the Levite/tithe intrusion is eliminated from Paul's message, "muzzle the ox" can be seen as a totally apt metaphor for the humble, indigent, hardworking position held by Paul and his co-workers, because they required only food, shelter, and basic necessities.

An example of the intent of the Law against “muzzling the ox” is James 5:4 “Behold, the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of sabaoth”.

God ordained a fair exchange of service for reward, which is the point that Paul is trying to make. In this case, those who have devoted themselves to preach, teach, discuss, and most of all truly live the truth about God's Kingdom plan as per the terms for preachers set down by Christ Himself, deserve the consideration of food and a place to stay, just as any other laborer that provides a service, whether human or animal. Today however, first we have to find one of these workmen of God who is qualified. Someone who is uncontaminated by materialistic self-interest, and who fits the bill of sincerity,
dedication, and humble selflessness. Until you find one of these legitimate workers, you need not be overly concerned as to what to give him.

Stopping a billionaire from manipulating the corn market in order to rip off a multitude of farmers is not an example of "muzzling the ox", and neither is denying million-dollar bonuses to crooked bank executives. Likewise, the fat, phony and "financially comfortable" preachers that we are stuck with today do not qualify as being part of Paul's subject matter here at all. This law is geared toward **honest work of productive value for honest payment** that has a tangible worth.

I understand that the social event and common bonding experience known as "going to church" has a significant perceived value to many people, so some of you may be offended at the thought that your preacher does not make the grade, but odds are, that he does not.

I am also not trying to tell you what to do with your money. You can spend it whenever and wherever you decide to, and pay your preacher whatever you wish, based on how you value this church-going experience. This is a purchase that is made much like a theater pass, ticket to the circus, membership in a social club, buying an ice cream cone, or any other worldly activity. Just do not confuse this type of personal spending in any way with what scripture defines as **giving to God**, or **honoring God with your wealth** because it is not; it's way, way not.

**Fat Shepherd Antitypes Among Us**

Ezekiel 34 supports Hebrews 7 and the dismissing of the Levites from their special position. Ezekiel rails on and on against the "fat shepherds" who are consumed in greed and self-interest. Verses 10-12 states: Thus says the Lord GOD, "Behold, I am against the shepherds, and I will demand My sheep from them and make them cease from feeding sheep. So the shepherds will not feed themselves anymore, but I will deliver My flock from their mouth, so that they will not be food for them.

For thus saith the Lord GOD; Behold, I, even I, will both search my sheep, and seek them out. As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day that he is among his sheep that are scattered; so will I seek out my sheep, and will deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day."

This "ceasing" was fulfilled at least once, when the Levitical priesthood was removed from authority. In theory, we should now have the new breed of
unpaid, non-materialistic, uncorruptable men of God of the New Covenant; of which John the Baptist, Peter, and Paul are prominent examples. There is no indication that God intended to replace one set of fat shepherds with another that we see today. A group of hireling-fat shepherds that today's pro-tithe preachers are in effect admitting themselves to be the analogy of, when they claim "Levite" antitype status.

It seems obvious that the same self-serving spirit of greed testified against in Ezekiel 34, and which was embodied later in the Pharisees for example, is also flourishing among us at this very moment those who get paid to preach, and particularly those who knowingly promote a fraudulent tithe.

Ezekiel 34:10-12 and the entire chapter is in direct contradiction to the pro-tithe position which states that today's preachers have been chosen to take over the Levites' position.

We understand that impostors claim the heritage of the true Israelites in the world today, claiming to be the "chosen people", but when will we open our eyes to the impostor nature of those within true Israel (among others) that claim the heritage of the Levites in order to make merchandise of God's people?

The No-Type-Antitype Realty

Even if Paul was talking to the Corinthians about the Hebrew temple, (which it appears he is not, but I am trying to exhaust all possibilities) it really does not matter. Whether Hebrew or pagan, this analogy is (again) in reference to food, - a well-deserved meal; it is just being used somewhat metaphorically. Paul is using an illustration, not creating a basis for a type and antitype doctrine. His statements are in reference only to the idea of the preacher/teacher of God's Word having the consideration of a little respect and decency from those that benefit from his teaching.

Paul could easily have said "Look mates, if you wanna be a Christian, ya gotta tithe. I need the dough, see? So hand it over." Like many preachers today do.
If ever there was a rational and logical time for Paul to use the word "tithe" or "the law of the tithe", if it were applicable, 1Corinthians Chapter 9 would have been it, but as we can see, it is not there.

The Apostle Peter stated of the Apostle Paul in 2Peter 3:16-18: “...according to the wisdom given to him, wrote unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; wherein are some things hard to be understood, which the ignorant and unsteadfast wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.

Ye therefore, beloved, knowing these things beforehand, beware lest, being carried away with the error of the wicked, ye fall from your own steadfastness. But grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.”

Paul may have been hard to understand on some subjects, but the tithe issue is not one of them.

Even so, the ignorant and unsteadfast preachers still manage to “wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction”, when they fabricate these allegedly pro-tithe scriptures, but not without taking their congregations down with them.

Peter has given us fair warning, stating in that last sentence that the teachings of Christ are the authority and example that we should strive for, not the error of the wicked.
Chapter 18
Muzzle the Ox (Ox Tales)

We are still dealing with 1Corinthians 9:7-14, which we examined in the previous chapter, and which pro-tithers consider to be a New Covenant bulwark scripture for their doctrine.

In this aspect of that scripture, Paul makes it a point to discuss the don't muzzle the ox verse (Deut 25:4), which pro-tithers will adamantly insist is a reference to tithing.

In reality, this scripture merely indicates that Paul is talking about a concept of being compensated in some basic, minimal way for services rendered - for effort and labor. Paul did not mention any Old Covenant tithe law at all. Furthermore he is not saying "since I preached something to you, that makes me the antitype of the Levites and you owe me ten percent of your income" as some tithe promoters would assert.

It is So, So Obvious.

Just read it - In 1Corinthians 9:8-9 Paul calls to attention God’s Law regarding the situation. Come on, you pro-nomian Law-teaching preachers - let's think about this real hard: If Paul was trying to enforce a tithe, which of God’s Laws do you think he would refer to?

Does Paul refer to the Law against adultery? No, because he's not talking to the Corinthians about adultery.

Does Paul refer to the Law of land rest? No, because he's not talking to the Corinthians about land rest.

Does Paul refer to the Law of the tithe? No, because he’s not talking to the Corinthians about the tithe.

Well then, does Paul refer to the Law of muzzling the ox? Yes! Yes, a thousand times yes. Because that is what Paul is talking to the Corinthians about - basic, minimal sustenance as basic support for his efforts. How much plainer
can it be? Deuteronomy 25:4 (the Law of not muzzling the ox) is not even near any scriptures about the tithe, or the temple, or Levites; it is an entirely different Law. This fact is so obvious that it should not have to be pointed out, but the need arises because the preachers have lied about this verse for so long that many people can not see it for what it plainly says.

Paul does not mention the Law of the tithe (Leviticus 27, Numbers 18, Deuteronomy 12 & 14). Paul does not call attention to examples of tithing from the Old Covenant scriptures (2Chronicles 31; Nehemiah 10, 12 or 14). Paul does not even quote Malachi, as a reasonable person would expect if the tithe was the topic of discussion.

Paul does not mention tithe even though as we can see, he had plenty of Law and scriptural examples to refer to.

Instead of tithe law, Paul brings up a “muzzle the ox” scripture, Deut 25:4 “Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn.” Which relates to an issue of fairness and justice - fair pay for honest work. Just as he did to Timothy in 1 Tim 5:18, “For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, The laborer is worthy of his reward.”

Do you see how Paul tied those two concepts together?

This relates to Deut 24:14-15 “Thou shalt not oppress an hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren, or of thy strangers that are in thy land within thy gates:

At his day thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it; for he is poor, and setteth his heart upon it: lest he cry against thee unto the LORD, and it be sin unto thee.”

and Lev 19:13 “Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbor, neither rob him: the wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning.”

This law is not specific to preachers. It is for the general protection of any worker, with a connotation to lower class common laborers, servants, or even to slaves. Paul is not looking to get rich or even to make a profit. He just wanted enough basic physical support to keep going, just as Jesus Christ instructed.

In this case the appointed compensation was a meal and a place to sleep to be precise - basic necessities. Who pays cash to their oxen? Who provides investment accounts, high-end SUV’s, or paid vacations for their cattle? This situation and the scripture that Paul brings into play have nothing whatsoever to do with tithing or a lavish lifestyle. Not a thing.
They do, however fit perfectly with the instructions of Jesus to the 12 Apostles (Matt Chapter 10:5-10, Mark 6:7-9, Luke 9:1-3), and to the 70 disciples.

Luke 10:3-7 “Go your ways: behold, I send you forth as lambs among wolves. Carry neither purse [money], nor scrip [extra food], nor shoes: and salute no man by the way.

And into whatsoever house ye enter, first say, Peace be to this house. And if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it: if not, it shall turn to you again. And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the laborer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house.”

1 Corinthians 9:4-9 “Have we not power to eat and to drink? Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?

Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working? Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock?

Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the same also? For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen?”

Perhaps you have noticed that Paul is speaking in terms of fundamental and immediate need; nothing long term or beyond basic human necessities.

Somehow, tithe promoters relate the “ox eating grain” reference to a Levite eating tithed food, who then shape-shifts into a modern preacher stuffing cash into his pocket; perhaps this “ox” theory has something to do with "bull".

They hang their hat on this chapter and behold - "proof" of a New Covenant tithe! Then, they say that since we now “know” that Paul is talking about a tithe law here; this provides the basis for an additional fiction: the so-called proof that the following verses about the temple workers refers to a modern tithe as well.

Now, I realize that I may be diagnosed with the newly invented Oppositional Defiance Disorder, but I am going to pose a couple of the most important questions for you, that you can ever ask yourself:

“Is my preacher lying to me?” and

"Am I being dumbed-down by a preacher who is using false logic and nonsense to make his point, then portraying it to me as being wisdom?"
Paul told Timothy basically “Know what you know, and who you learned it from” in 2 Tim 3:14. This was meant in a positive way for Timothy, because he had reliable teachers. It applies just as well to us today in a negative way about charlatan “authorities” of all types.

With the above example about the ox fresh in your mind, think about it - How much do you know, and who do you know it from? Do you have confidence that what you "know", is really as true as you once thought it was, considering the source of your information? In my opinion most congregations have been trained to accept deception disguised as knowledge.

There is nothing more destructive than the certainty of a belief in so-called truth that is not true.

If we can see that the various foundations that the tithe-takers start with are untrue, then the entire doctrine collapses from the vacuum created by the lack of any real, credible pro-tithe evidence whatsoever.

Back to Paul and 1 Corinthians 9

As for the "right" that Paul refers to - This right is not a right to engage in the fraud of taking a tithe, but a right to receive an agreed-upon, or commonly expected compensation for his efforts. A right to not be cheated, or starving, or cold.

The point is, to spend more time on his mission, and less time on menial labor required just to get a meal. It is the same concept as Acts 6:2 - much to get done, and only so many hours in a day to do them, so they arranged make the most of the time available.

The idea that Paul is trying to convey goes something like this: If someone walks up to you and starts preaching, you owe them nothing, because you did not ask for anything. Once you say "Tell me more" or "Stay a few days or weeks and teach me more", it then implies a contract of an exchange of value.

This would apply to minstrels, storytellers, philosophers, teachers - anyone who has caught your attention. You find that their information or entertainment has value, that is why you requested more. Therefore by right of the muzzle the ox concept, you should provide something of value in exchange, if

"There is nothing more destructive than belief in the certainty of a so-called truth that is not true."
you are able, even if it is just a meal or two, or three, which is the scriptural
daily wage of a preacher, as well as for oxen. Matthew 10:10, and Luke 10:7 in
which Jesus says "and in the self same house abide ye, eating and drinking such things as
they have; for worthy is the laborer of his hire".

Jesus was clearly equating room and board with the word “hire”, and that is
all that Paul was looking for.

Paul apparently had a willing audience; therefore he had a right to receive
some sort of hire, but was being denied even this basic support from these
apparent cheapskates. In fact, in Philippians 2:25-30 Paul mentions an associate
Epaphroditus, who almost died due to lack of supplies, because the Philippians
were unaware of their situation. This indicates just how close to the edge they
were living.

In any case, there is no temple, no sacrifice, and no tithe at all involved in
this arrangement for God’s true New Covenant workers.

In addition to that, “worthy is the laborer of his hire” is a concept with two
parallel trains of thought. We predominantly interpret this phrase as “make sure
you pay the laborer”, but the other counterbalancing idea is that “the laborer
must be worthy of his pay”. Some preachers are big on the getting paid part,
but not so keen on the doing the labor part. Especially when it comes to doing
the labor honestly and well, as Paul did. That is apparently why they want
security of this unconditional welfare entitlement called a “tithe”.

This concept of “wages” as described above is verified by the following:

1 Corinthians 9:11 “If we sowed spiritual things in you, is it too much if we reap material
things from you?” and 9:14 “So also the Lord directed those who proclaim the gospel to live
of the gospel.”

To “live of the gospel” does not mean profit, financially prosper, or getting
stinking rich from preaching the gospel, as many of today’s preachers want to
insist.

Philippians 4:14-19 “Notwithstanding ye have well done, that ye did communicate with
my affliction. Now ye Philippians know also, that in the beginning of the gospel, when I
departed from Macedonia, no church communicated with me as concerning giving and
receiving, but ye only.
For even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my necessity. Not because I desire a gift: but I desire fruit that may abound to your account. But I have all, and abound: I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, wellpleasing to God. But my God shall supply all your need according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus.”

By deciphering the KJV language, we see that the Philippeans were considerate to Paul, even while others were not. He appreciates it not so much because of his own benefit, but because he knows that they understood the concept of freewill giving, having proven themselves to be selfless in general. Because of their spirit of empathy and generosity toward others, they themselves will be the ultimate beneficiaries of this spirit, and of God’s blessing. As mentioned before: there is no promise of riches in return for their kindness; only that God will supply their needs.

Galatians 6:6. “The one who is taught the word is to share all good things with the one who teaches him.”

This is a verse which is sometimes used to support a pay-the-preacher paradigm, but its use for such purpose is unjustified. When the term "share all good things" is examined in the original Greek, we see that it is not speaking of material goods or money, but to intellectually share thoughts, comments and questions about what is being taught. In other words teaching was not a one way flow of verbalization such as most of today’s preaching is, but an interactive discussion of ideas, questions, and experiences.

So, once again, what is missing from the above mentioned scriptures, if you are a tithe believer?
That is right, there is no mention of tithe. Playing the "tithe is the Law" card would have saved Paul a lot of time, and pleading, and explanation; if that was what he was talking about. Obviously it was not.

However, even though money is not mentioned in any of the above-mentioned scriptures, those who seek tithe money may point to them and say “See here? It says they gave Paul money. Money can be defined as ‘material’, and also as ‘good!’”; “We have here the ‘Pauline Money-for-Nothing Model’ and the ‘Pay the Preacher Precedent!’”
They might say that giving the preacher a hundred or five hundred dollars could feed him for a week or a month, then we would not have to be so concerned about his day-to-day needs. This seems to be a practical approach (though it has absolutely nothing to do with the tithe) except for the existence of those numerous scriptures that express an abhorrence to monetary gain made in God's name. Scriptures that allow for basic necessities only; food, clothing, a place to stay. This is the blueprint created by many, many scriptures that describe a modest-to-austere lifestyle for a man of God.

There are at least two reasons for this prohibition against cash that are readily apparent. First is the obvious question that once they start accepting money, where does it end? "If $100 for a week is good, then $500 is even better, and $50,000 will set them up for the year, or will that last only six months, or even three?" This can quickly and easily spiral to an out-of-control dependence on the money rather than on God's providence. This has become so axiomatic we can count on that happening almost like we can count on the law of gravity.

**Revelation 3:16-17** says “So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.

Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked:

Regardless of this warning, for some reason the tithe-seeking (and other) preachers want to be “rich, and increased in goods and have need of nothing.”

Secondly, God’s instructions require daily dependence on His providence, which in general would be manifesting itself through the Body of Christ. This sets the scene for daily personal contact and interaction between the preacher and the people, whereas wealth tends to create a divide between the "successful" wealthy preacher and the commoners. The question of sincerity eventually arises as to whether he is showing up on Sunday to serve God, or to make more money.

The non-profit but very profitable religion business model engulfing us today has all but wiped out the idea of what a true man of God preacher should be.

Paul did not have a right to demand any type of payment in the form of money as preachers today claim to have. You will notice that 1Peter 5:2 speaks
of money obtained as a result of preaching or teaching God's Word as "base gain" or "filthy lucre", even though it may have been a reasonable amount and even though the listeners may have appreciated hearing the message and willingly paid the preacher. That's all irrelevant because money for preaching was and is forbidden. Today filthy lucre is what we call dirty money – money obtained by dishonest or immoral means.

John 6:27 “Work not for the food which perisheth, but for the food which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give unto you: for him the Father, even God, hath sealed.”

I mean how plain can it be? Again, food is the payment. It was food in the Old Covenant for the Levites, food and basic necessities for the prophets, food and basic necessities for the Apostles and disciples, and that idea carries right through the New Covenant up to today; in theory, anyway.

Parenthetically, this scripture alludes to the idea that the non-materialism of basic sustenance is only a stepping stone to the receiving of spiritual food which leads to eternal life. This is consistent with what Jesus said about not living on physical bread alone but on the Word of God. (Matt 4:4, Luke 4:4)

So do not think that preachers receiving only basic sustenance is a radical concept; in reality that is only an intermediate phase of God’s program for those who can hack it.

The word "Godliness" in scripture is at its base synonymous with non-materialism and selflessness. Paul mentions this subject numerous times: Romans 2, 1Timothy, particularly chapter 6, 2Timothy, and Titus, to name a few. Also 1Peter 1:4-8.

Generally speaking, Godliness is a precursor to true righteousness, and so-called righteousness without Godliness almost always amounts to "self-righteousness"; or worse yet false righteousness. These are just another way of describing hypocritical piety or arrogant judgmentalism that comes from knowing and applying the Law mentally, without having the spiritual temperance and patience that comes from a mature, heartfelt sense of humility and empathy.

Romans 8:5 says “For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit.”

If you are looking for a hot stock tip, or which team to bet on, by all means seek your materialistic, money-seeking preacher's advice. But if you want
spiritual advice or insight, you need to find someone who walks the spiritual walk of austerity and non-materialism described in scripture. Unfortunately today, that is like finding a talking unicorn.

For all practical purposes in today’s world, we need to be eighty-sixing the false teachers, getting back to the basic teachings of Christ and the Apostles, and ditching every single doctrine that can not withstand informed critical scrutiny. This means starting at square one on your trek through scripture itself, reading it for what it plainly says, and see what it tells you.

As the Amplified Bible makes clear in 2Corinthians 2:17 Paul states: “For we are not, like so many, [like hucksters making a trade of] peddling God’s Word [shortchanging and adulterating the divine message]; but like [men] of sincerity and the purest motive”

So according to this scripture, sincerity and pure motives are depicted as the opposite of being paid to preach.

2Corinthians 12:17-18 “Did I make a gain of you by any of them whom I sent unto you? I desired Titus, and with him I sent a brother. Did Titus make a gain of you? walked we not in the same spirit? walked we not in the same steps?” Paul is saying “Did we ever once accept money from you?” With the obvious answer being “No, we did not.”

2Corinthians 10:2 “wherewith I think to be bold against some, which think of us as if we walked according to the flesh.” Meaning that when Paul got there, he was going to confront those people that claimed that Paul had human motives (money, prestige, personal power over others, etc) and set them straight.

2Corinthians 11:7 “...because I preached the gospel of God to you without charge?”

So was Paul two-faced? Did he preach “without charge” and then go around grumbling that he had not been paid in 1Corinthians 9 and elsewhere? No, of course not. He preached without expecting a monetary fee for doing so, but he did expect to be sustained in food, clothing, and a place to lay his head – just as Jesus instructed. This standard holds true up to this very day, but is rarely observed. We are so surrounded by hireling preachers that we think a well paid worldly preacher is normal, even admirable.

Like so many other things – “You get what you pay for.” If you pay for a hireling preacher, you will get a hireling preacher. The more you pay him, the

"You don’t really think that the more money he gets, the more spiritually insightful he will be, do you?"
more biased and more of a hireling he will be. You don't really think that the more money he gets, the more spiritually insightful he will be, do you?

Though the KJV obscures it a little, it is pretty plain to see that in 1Corinthians 2:9-16, Paul is stating flat out that worldly people know worldly things, but spiritual insights are given to spiritual people.

“But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.

But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.

Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.

Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.

But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man. For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ.”

These worldly quasi-Christian preachers were abundant already in Paul’s time, as he tells Timothy in 2Timothy 3:5 “Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.”

Paul was not “peddling” or selling his gospel-preaching services as most of today’s preachers do. He was not asking for charity, or money, and certainly not expecting to receive tithe by any stretch of the imagination. If he did, then his statement in Acts 20:33 would be a lie: "Silver or gold, or apparel [extra apparel was a form of wealth] of no one did I covet."

Why? - Because he (and the others) did not want to become known as a hireling, nor did he want to be a slave to unrighteous mammon as was the case with many paid preachers back then, as well as today. Paul considered his previous beliefs, worldly priorities and previously held material possessions to be no more than dung (Phil 3:8). This attitude is the mark of a true man of God.

They were living the lifestyle clearly instructed by Jesus in Luke 12:15-31: "Be not anxious for this life". Possessions mean nothing; preach, and let God provide. Philippians 4:11-12 “ Not that I speak in respect of want: for I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content.
I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound: everywhere and in all things I am instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need.”

Once again, the KJV that I quoted here makes it a bit difficult to understand, but what Paul is saying he has been instructed to take it as it comes: in need or well supplied, hungry, filled, he can take material goods or leave it. That is a reference to the ground rules laid out by Jesus to His disciples. Accepting more than basic necessities would have been gross disobedience and profiteering, just as Gehazi attempted in 2Kings 5:20-27.

Paul had the spiritual strength and discipline to be content under all conditions. Though he may have enjoyed comfort like anyone else, it was really not a primary issue with him. (In contrast, “my” old comfort-laden, well paid preachers made it a point to say how “tough” their job was.)

Acts 16:15 is a good example of the hospitality-as-payment that Paul was talking about. “And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there. And she constrained us.”

As well as Acts 15:33-4 “And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway. And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house.”

In neither case of these highly motivated new Christians is there a record of them offering money at all, let alone tithe money, to enrich Paul and his associates. By contrast, the preachers that I have known personally would reject the Scriptural hospitality and fellowship of staying at someone’s home, and instead insist on staying in a hotel when they travel.

Matthew 10:41-2 sets the humble tone for the men of God: “He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet’s reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man’s reward. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward.”

Some of you might say of Paul’s lifestyle “well, who would ever want to live a dog’s life like that? We would never find a real preacher!”

That is the materialistic view and as mentioned above, in today’s world it is also probably true. Without their financial desires being fulfilled by having an income higher than 80-90% of those who tithe to them, those who were “called
by God to preach” would suddenly be “called” to something that involved a pay check, commissions, and a retirement account. That is just as well, since having no preacher at all is better than having a hireling preacher.

Matthew 13:22-3 talks about the parable of the sower: “He also that received seed among the thorns is he that heareth the word; and the care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful.

But he that received seed into the good ground is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it; which also beareth fruit, and bringeth forth, some an hundredfold, some sixty, some thirty.”

Luke 8:14-5 adds a little more information: “And that which fell among thorns are they, which, when they have heard, go forth, and are choked with cares and riches and pleasures of this life, and bring no fruit to perfection.

But that on the good ground are they, which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience.”

So those concerned about getting rich are portrayed as not having an honest and good heart necessary for receiving the truth of the Word. This lesson applies to us all, but especially any preacher that you listen to. How can anyone hope to rise above materialism as the Word instructs, by listening to a worldly, thorny preacher who promotes something as blatantly false as the myth of the tithe?

A well known quote goes something like: "The problems facing humanity today cannot be solved with the same level of consciousness that created them." The same can be applied to the personal and collective state of disobedience to Christ; you can not logically expect solutions to worldly sinfulness to come from a preacher who is himself immersed in worldly desires.

That is exactly why Paul obeyed the standard of poverty practiced by John the Baptist and Jesus. He did it to separate the wheat from the chaff of the preachers of his day. A non-materialistic lifestyle actually gives strength to the spiritual, while it is an intolerable royal pain to those who are worldly.

2 Corinthians 12:9-10 “ And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.

Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong.”
It is called the “nothing to lose” strategy, and it is not for prideful, selfish or materialistic people. Nor is it for those who seek the comfort of money rather than the sufficiency of God’s grace, as stated above.

The standard of material poverty (the practice actually dated back to the prophets) was intended to weed out the counterfeit “men of God” that existed then, and of course it still does.

For example, Amos 7:12-16 reads: “Also Amaziah said unto Amos, O thou seer, go, flee thee away into the land of Judah, and earn your bread there, and prophesy there: But prophesy not again any more at Bethel: for it is the king’s chapel, and it is the king’s court. Then answered Amos, and said to Amaziah, I am no prophet, neither was I of a prophet’s guild; but I was an herdman, and a gatherer of wild figs: And the LORD took me as I followed the flock, and the LORD said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel.”

So what was Amos saying - “I am not a prophet but I’m a prophet”? No, not exactly. He pointed out the distinction that he was not a professional prophet or a member of the “prophet’s union”, but was instead a true prophet of God.

So even way back then you had a cottage industry of “profit prophets”, and then there were the true prophets like Amos that were drafted by God into service, and who had to be content with basic food and clothing, living one day to the next on what God provided. These were two totally different groups of people.

Micah condemns taking money as payment for doing God’s work, considering it corruption and hypocrisy in 3:11 – “Her leaders pronounce judgment for a bribe, her priests instruct for a price and her prophets divine for money. Yet they lean on the LORD saying, ‘Is not the LORD in our midst? Calamity will not come upon us.’"

Notice that he does not say "instruct falsely for a price" or "divine falsely for money". Just the fact that they were being paid at all in cash was sin enough for Micah to condemn it, let alone any issues of corrupt teachings and false prophecies that came as a result of it.

Samuel never accepted a dime for his prophesy (1Sam 12:3-4). Moses had zero financial gain for his part in leading Israel out of bondage (Numbers 16:15).

In 2Kings 5:19-27 Elisha and Gehazi showed us that financial payment for spiritual services is forbidden, with dire consequences for greedy Gehazi. This
story is well worth taking a moment to read, and then compare to today’s preachers.

Zechariah 11:12-13 records the nobles giving the prophet a payment of silver, which was regarded as an insult and which he was in turn instructed by God to cast into the temple for charity purposes like a hot potato.

1Kings 14:3, the prophet Ahaijah was given food and honey as an offering by the king. Gifts like this, not cash, were proper and typical for a true man of God.

And again, Amos took exception to being thought of as a professional prophet (Amos 7:12-15), Paul certainly accepted no money as payment for doing God’s work (Acts 20:32-34, numerous others)

What then, is the take-away lesson from all this?

The lesson is that when we look at the sum teaching of scripture, we see that we are not to be paid for teaching God’s Word, or performing a baptism or wedding or funeral service, or for preaching. This ban includes cash gifts in any amount more than that needed for immediate basic necessities and for the expenses incurred by the preacher.

Prophets were not to expect payment for revealing God’s messages. “Filthy lucre” as Peter calls it, is not God’s intended payment for His workers. It is not that money itself is “filthy” – it is just (in theory) a means to store and transport value. There is nothing wrong with money that is paid to a field laborer, for example, who in turn takes it to buy himself some bread.

The money is made “filthy” by the heart and intent of the one who obtains it immorally. Such as: money that is stolen, obtained by fraud, used to corrupt or for evil purposes such as the thirty pieces of silver paid to Judas, or as I have pointed out - money for preaching.

Deuteronomy 23:18 says “Thou shalt not bring the hire of a whore, or the price of a dog, into the house of the LORD thy God for any vow: for even both these are an abomination unto the LORD thy God.”

Is this price that is being spoken of here a certain numerical amount, or instead does God care where the offerings come from? Obviously, it is the source of the money that is the issue here. He apparently does not want the negative energy that attaches itself to dirty money to contaminate the temple,
just as He did not want the selfish or lackadaisical spirit that attaches itself to an inferior lamb brought up for sacrifice. It is not necessarily the money or lamb that God cares about, it is the pure energy and spirit of devotion, submissiveness, selflessness, empathy and willingness of the giver that accompanies these items that is important. The material gift to the recipient is just the means of delivering the real gift to God, which is the spirit of sacrifice that comes from the giver. This can take place any time, whether it involves feeding the poor, or being kind to animals.

That is why Ananias and Sapphira checked in to the Dirt Pile Hotel in Acts 5:1-10. Even though they gave a substantial amount of money, their gift was polluted by the spirit of deception. God is spirit, so it appears that a higher level of selfless, honest, generous spiritual energy is what He wants. He does not appreciate disingenuous spirits that are deceitful, prideful, or hypocritical.

That is why His workmen, those called “men of God” must be non-materialistic; so their energy and spirit remain uncontaminated by worldly desires and they can be as in-tune with God as they can possibly be. That is the purposes of fasting, ashes, and sackcloth. They deprive a person of as much physical comfort as possible as a means of focusing them in on the spiritual.

There is nothing wrong with enjoying physical comforts and even temporary luxuries when they present themselves, just as Jesus did, but a true man of God needs to have the discipline to leave such pleasures just as quickly as he accepted them, and to be just as content either way.

A man with the cares and pleasures of the world on his mind is at best a handicapped advisor. They may have perhaps some sound practical advice or experience to offer, but a very limited value as a true spiritual influence to others.

It then goes without saying that someone who desires worldly delights and comfort so much that he will cheat, steal, or deceive others to get it, has a negative value to the Christian community. In other words you are better off not even knowing or associating with such a person, because he is going to justify his immoral actions with false teachings to indicate that his behavior is “righteous”.

In 2Corinthians 11:12 Paul writes: “What I am doing, I will continue to do (self imposed poverty) that I may cut off opportunity from those who desire an opportunity to be regarded just as we are in the matter about which they are boasting.”

Paul is saying that there were some bad preachers that wanted to establish an illusion of legitimacy. He calls them “wicked men and impostors” in 2Timothy 3:13.

In Philippians 3:17-19 Paul says “Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an ensample. For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: Whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things.”

Do not forget, these are not atheists or pagans or Satanists that Paul is talking about here. These people wore the guise of Christians, but were preachers made up their own self-serving doctrines, and who wanted to be considered as being just as legitimate and authoritative as Paul and the true Christians were, while at the same time were “minding earthly things” like financial gain.

For example Acts 20:29-31 “For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.

Therefore watch, and remember, that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.”

Because of Paul’s example of self-discipline and devotion to God’s instructions for His workers, the false preachers who wanted to make the claim that they represented God’s truth, would have to live up to the original standard of material poverty in order to be identified as a true worker of God. That original Old Covenant standard was met and exceeded by Jesus, and lived by Paul, Peter, Timothy, Titus, etc.

This standard of walking the walk, and living the talk of non-materialism that Paul followed was one that the phonies could not meet. Thus it separated the sheep from the goats, and still does so to this day for those who know what it is about.

Paul says in Phil 3:17 “Brethren, be followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an ensample.”
Paul’s instruction of non-materialism appears to be diametrically opposed to that of at least one pro-tithe preacher who claimed in his CD series that when Jesus said “the harvest is great, but the laborers are few”, (Matt 9:37-38, Luke 10:2) His intention and meaning was that the laborers were few because there was not enough money to hire more of them. Yes, you read that right.

The point of that preacher being that you are defying Jesus’ prayer and wishes for more preachers by not tithing, apparently because men of God will not preach unless they are paid for it.

So then I have to ask: If that was the case, and money was an issue as this pro-tithe preacher says, then why did Jesus not simply hire more disciples for the harvest? Problem solved. Why lament the fact that there were not enough laborers when Jesus could turn rocks into gold if He wished, and could have hired all the Gehazi-type preachers that He wanted?

Of course that man provided no scriptural evidence of his asinine claim, but again, that is a common trait of the pro-tithe preachers. They make these off-the-wall statements strategic times, and no one challenges them.

This man’s teaching sounds like "another Jesus" of 2Corinthians 11:4 and Galatians 1:6-8 being preached, and that Paul warned us about.

This pro-tithe preacher’s position is a total materialistic antithesis of the type of people Jesus was looking for, and is yet another example of the type of fallacies that these yellow preachers resort to. But I guess, in all fairness, this paid preacher made that statement apparently because all he understands is a worldly, materialistic perspective. “...Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.”

It implies to me that if he was with Jesus back then, that preacher would not have followed Jesus without being paid to do it, revealing an attitude that preaching is a business career to him just like becoming a banker, insurance agent or car salesman.

Galatians 5:17 tells us that the desires of this world (the flesh) is directly opposite to the will of the Spirit. Galatians 5 in general says that if the Spirit is dominant, a law is not needed because that person will do the right thing without ever having heard the law. The Law of God is there to control those who are dominated by fleshly, materialistic, worldly desires. That is why there are
prohibitions against theft, treachery, and fraud; all of which are elements of the modern tithe doctrine.

Money is a shallow, worldly incentive to pay as compensation for worldly, physical tasks. If you want a house painted, for example, there is no shortage of people who will do it. If you want it finished in two weeks instead of three, some extra money will cause this to be done. Materialistic incentives get materialistic results.

Money can also help someone with a sincere, heartfelt caring, to accomplish what they need to do to help others, but money can not put the caring into the heart of someone who does not have it there to begin with. In that case all that more money can accomplish is to cause someone to pretend to care about others more; to put more effort into faking it while he takes more vacations and buys more investments.

Likewise more money does not put more spiritual insight into the heart of someone whose heart is already preoccupied by worldly matters such as gaining wealth. Galatians 5:17 says that self-indulgence in worldly desires is the antithesis of the Holy Spirit. Similarly, Romans 12:2 says that the way to understand the will of God is to first alienate yourself from materialism and worldly desires.

How do you expect to learn things of the spirit from a man who prioritizes personal wealth? That is kind of like expecting a sumo wrestler to teach you how to play a violin. The tragedy is that there are thousands of preachers like him, and millions of Christians learning from them.

1Corinthians 15:33 "Do not be deceived: Bad company corrupts good morals."

Preachers such as this obviously value cash up front, as opposed to a reward in Heaven that Paul speaks of in 1Corinthians 9:17-18 “For if I do this thing willingly, I have a reward: but if against my will, a dispensation of the gospel is committed unto me. What is my reward then? Verily that, when I preach the gospel, I may make the gospel of Christ without charge, that I abuse not my power in the gospel.”

So, Paul equates the act of taking payment for preaching with abusing his power in the gospel. What is his “power in the gospel”? That is another whole
discussion, but let us just say that it is the trust that people put in their teacher to *tell the truth*. If it was not good for Paul to abuse that trust by using it as leverage to obtain money, then today’s preachers should not abuse their position of trust by taking or soliciting money for themselves either; if they claim to be a true man of God.

The scriptural wages of a true man of God are clearly defined in scripture, as we have seen thus far, and that subject is covered more completely in Chapter 27 "Real Men of God Don't Want Money".
Chapter 19
“Honor”=Money=Tithe

First Timothy 5:17 has also been used as a basis for preachers to receive your "tithe" money. It says: "Let the elders that rule well ["Serving" is actually a more accurate word than "ruling" Matt 20:25-28, 23:11; Mark 10:43; Luke 22:26-27, 1Peter 5:3] be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine."

Tithe promoters say that "honor" means money, because the Greek word means “of value”; and because the following verse, Timothy 5:18 states: "For the scripture saith, thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, The laborer is worthy of his reward [or hire]."

Once again, the pro-tithers are hanging their hat on this scripture about the ox. We have already gone through what “muzzle the ox” means and it has nothing to do with tithing. For the same reasons mentioned earlier it indicates that they are not talking about tithe, or even money with this statement either.

So where do these preachers get a money aspect to 1Timothy 5:18, let alone any connection to a tithe?

They claim that the word “reward/hire” means money. To justify their position the pro-tithers quote Matt 20:8 “So when even was come, the Lord of the vineyard saith unto his steward, Call the laborers, and give them their hire, beginning from the last unto the first.” As well as James 5:4 “Behold, the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud,...”

Then the preacher explains that the Greek word for “hire” is the same in both of these scriptures. So, since Matt 20:8 is supposedly talking about money as payment (or hire), and James 5:4 “probably is too”, they state that 1Tim 5:17 is referring to cash as well.
They come to this conclusion by ignoring the fact that the word “hire” can actually mean anything at all. It could be the praise and appreciation given to volunteers, for example, but usually it is something of material value such as room and board, food, or even another service given in exchange for services rendered; a fact that makes the “muzzle the ox” metaphor all the more appropriate; emphasizing the concept of basic physical maintenance as being the only requirement.

(The procedure that they use to create fallacies like this is very important to understand. To see exactly how all this was done, in a step-by-step manner, along with evidence of its intentionality, see Appendix A: Anatomy of a Deception. It is definitely worth the trip.)

2Thessalonians 3:10 says "For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat."

We have been conditioned to think they do not eat because they have not been paid money with which to buy food, because people today are almost always paid with money. Paul did not say “neither should he be paid”. The true meaning of this verse is that the pay was the food - the daily bread, and this is consistent with other scriptures as well as much of history.

During the Great Depression, for example, people worked on farms just for food, a place to stay, and twenty five cents a day. So payment in basic necessities is not a concept that is unknown.

Another possible example: Luke 12:41-42 “And the Lord said, Who then is the faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall set over his household, to give them their portion of food in due season? Blessed is that servant, whom his lord when he cometh shall find so doing.”

This scripture implies that food was the payment of the household staff.

That is in line with Jesus’ instructions in Matthew 10:10, and Luke 10:7. Luke 10:7 in which Jesus says "and in the self same house abide ye, eating and drinking such things as they have; for worthy is the laborer of his hire". There is no guesswork here. This is not an implication, but a flat-out statement that room and board constituted their pay.
John 10:1-8 Says that any preacher that does not abide in the instructions of Jesus first and foremost is a “thief and robber”. This is referring in part to preachers for profit; any of them who accept money as personal gain for preaching.

Paul sums up the sentiment of a true worker for Christ in 1Timothy 6:8 - "having food and raiment let us be therewith content."

Actually, I have short-changed you a bit with that scripture. Let us look at 1Timothy 6:3-12 in its full context because it really spells it all out:

“If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness [a non-materialistic, moneyless lifestyle mentioned above]: He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, Perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that [financial] gain is godliness: from such withdraw thyself.

But godliness with contentment [non-materialism] is great gain. For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment let us be therewith content.

But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.

But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses.”

Paul is not going so far as even addressing the subject of a tithe fraud, he is talking about plain old religion-based capitalism of any sort: preachers who want to prosper financially from preaching.

So, having had their way with the word “hire” they then proceed to abuse the word “honor” in 1Timothy 5:17 by claiming that the word there means a monetary payment: “Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine.”

The Greek word for “honor” in that scripture is Strong’s #5092, which is very close in meaning to #5091 which means to regard as valuable, or to esteem highly as being precious. The difference being that #5092 has the added
connotation of recognizing a value by paying respect or expressing appreciation for the person's worth. It can represent monetary payment, but is also used figuratively, according to Strong's as “esteem of the highest degree”. This would certainly be the case in this instance, given the context and circumstances.

One is an inner feeling, and the other is an outward expression of that feeling. Acts 28:10 is a good example: “Who also honored [5092] us with many honors [5091]; and when we departed, they laded us with such things as were necessary.”

The second half of that verse (and when we departed…) is not directly tied to the thought in the first half, so it is not like they were “laded with honors”.

They outwardly paid them honor, with words expressing their inner feelings of appreciation that they had for these men.

The point is that there is no indication of money involved. If there was, it would be only as much as necessary to cover the immediate overhead costs, for instance to pay their way as ship passengers.

As an additional note, look again at the second half of Acts 28:10 above: “Who also honored us with many honors; and when we departed, they laded us with such things as were necessary.”

Paul healed many of these people, and they showered him with honors of appreciation, but they only “laded us with such things as were necessary”. It sounds like no bags of money, or jewels, or credit account at the bank, or other material wealth as the pro-tithers would have us believe. It involved just enough provisions as they could use in the short term (“as were necessary”).

This once again, is exactly as it is supposed to be for the bond-servants, according to the Master, Jesus.

As we covered earlier, tithing to someone as a means of honoring them with a financial reward was a practice of the ancient pagan cultures. Pro-tithers take a decidedly poignant Christian situation described in Acts 28, and interpret it in worldly terms of a pagan culture when they read this monetary reward into the act of honoring those who are in service to Christ.

If “honor” really meant payment of money as pro-tithers claim, it would have been word #591, just as it is in any other place in the New Testament where it is referring to material wealth, or an earthly reward of some type.

1Peter 5:3 says to teach and minister to others “willingly, readily, without payment of money, without assuming authority over them, but leading by example.”
How can this scripture be true if, as the tithe promoters assert, Paul was in effect telling Timothy to hold out for double pay (double honor), (plus “first fruit tithes”, plus offerings, according to some) as part of his contract negotiations? Who is wrong here - Peter and Paul, or the money-coveting preachers?

Once again we see that the pro-tithe preachers take a perfectly innocent, honest statement of scripture - in this case 1Timothy 5:17-18 about respect and brotherly love - and do it violence; twisting and perverting it to give it a monetary, commercially marketable application; making fantastic statements about plain words in Scripture and in the process denying that other scriptures like 1Timothy 6:8 and 1Peter 5:3 mean what they say. (See appendix A)

A 24% Tithe?

Let’s think about the pro-tithe spin on the “double honor” concept for a minute to delve into the asininity of it.

If, for the sake of argument we ignore all the pertinent scriptures that indicate otherwise and assume that the "reward" spoken of here is money; then following pro-tithe logic, you should now be paying 20% because "double honor" = double pay = double tithe, according to the pro-tithe myth.

Wait, not so fast; this is a cash redemption, so as we established earlier it’s not 10% but instead is 12% that is being doubled, for a total of 24% off the top of your income from all sources that these preachers would want, not 20%.

No, wait one more time. This is the same preacher who wants you to hand over your “first fruit tithe” first, and then pay your regular tithe, and then double it all because he is “ruling well” as a preacher. If you doubt that he is ruling well, just ask him and he will assure you that he is.

So in order for us to “honor God” or to “follow God’s Law”, this conceited jamoke wants 34% of your income to go to him, or is it 44%? Is the first fruit tithe also supposed to be doubled? I’m losing track of it all. Maybe they will do a thirteen-part study explaining that subject as well.

So, I wonder if I understand this correctly... They say that 20/24% (double honor = double tithe) is supposed to go to the preachers that actually
do study, and use their honest knowledge to preach, teach, or perform any other service that is generally of value and are therefore ruling well.

Aside from that, you would pay only 10/12% to those preachers that do not seem to do much of anything other than lie around in the church lounge, plagiarize a few sermons, and call themselves a preacher, man of God, etc.; and who therefore are not ruling well, but they still have that 10% coming anyway according to the theory, or else you are "robbing God" by not giving it to them. Is this correct?

Hebrews 13:5 says “Make sure that your character is free from the love of money, being content with what you have;”

But this pro-tithe preacher tells us not only to pay them something that they do not rightfully have coming to them, but to then double it. What is wrong with this picture?

This cannot be the only preacher claiming this, nor can it be the only outlandish, ungodly scam that criminal preachers have counterfeited from legitimate scriptures. This is only one of many examples of what I meant when I said earlier that their incomes were limited only by their imaginations.

Hebrews 13:7 follows up, and explicitly instructs us to expect non-materialistic behavior in our preachers or anyone else of a supposedly mature Christian nature in a leadership position (these are not necessarily the same person), and to be looking for good examples. Or does that mean we should keep a wary eye out for bad examples? Probably both, but you will not know which is which if you allow yourself to be fed scripture without critically examining it to see if you are being provided intelligent truthful information. As it is today, people see even the worst of preachers as being righteous, even while they take the congregation’s money. This is because the preachers are the ones who have formed the people's definition of what righteousness should look like.

In this process the preachers have tailored that definition to match their own behavior, thereby portraying themselves as being righteous. That definition of Christian righteousness includes you paying them a tenth of what you have worked for, and it also includes them being righteous when they take it.
An independent reading of scripture will quite readily dispel the illusions that paid or materialistic preachers are acceptable to God. Anyone who supports a preacher that promotes an abomination like this “double honor equals double tithe” doctrine, quite frankly deserves what they get.

Scripture does not allow the practice of preaching God's Word for a profit, though in their ignorance there may today be well-intentioned people who do so. That same statement could also be said of those who preach today's tithe in general; they actually think they are doing something good.

However there is something fundamentally dark and wrong about the heart and mind of a preacher who goes to such great lengths to misrepresent scriptures by devising and promoting such embarrassingly obvious frauds such as this "double tithe" premise. "Double tithe" is unheard of in God's Old Covenant Law. Has that fact ever crossed the mind of any tither in that preacher's flock? Yet the "Kingdom law teacher" that I have heard it from and who probably invented this false doctrine, labels those who disagree with him as anti law or anti kingdom, etc. Even though this double tithe doctrine is more "double Dutch deception" than anything else.

Ephesians 5:3-7 is emphatic about worldliness: “But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints; Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks.

For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God. Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience.

Be not ye therefore partakers with them. For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light:

(For the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth;)

Proving what is acceptable unto the Lord. And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.”

To clarify a few key words and terms: the word "uncleanness" means the carnal emotions that are not quite as egregious as lust and fornication. This might be traits like envy, pride, indignation, and self-centeredness, etc.

"He'll teach spiritual concepts the way a first-grader explains to his class mates how babies come from a cabbage patch."
The word “covetousness” is not limited to blatant larcenous, *I want the world J.P. Morgan type of psychopathy. Covetousness means selfish desire in even small amounts*, and it certainly includes the amount of self-interest and greed that it takes to deceive their brother into the vassalage of giving up a tenth of his income; better known as today’s tithe.

That term “nor covetous man, who is an idolater” is not listing two separate conditions of “covetous” and “idolater”. Instead it is identifying covetousness (or greed) *as being a form of idolatry; a man is by definition an idolater because he is covetous*. This is supported a little more clearly by Colossians 3:5-6 "Put to death therefore your members which are upon the earth: fornication, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, which is idolatry; for which things’ sake cometh the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience: wherein ye also once walked, when ye lived in these things;

*Even the obfuscated KJV makes this point clear* "Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry:"

It goes on to say that this type of person is not qualified for God’s Kingdom, and that anyone who follows them will incur God’s wrath as being disobedient.

This disobedience is being assumed because it basically goes without saying that if you follow a worldly preacher, no matter how slick his presentation is, you will be on the track of ignorance and disobedience right from the start. His words are vain because worldly people do not have the capacity to fully grasp, let alone teach spiritual concepts. He will teach spiritual concepts the way a first-grader explains to his class mates how babies come from a cabbage patch, and others will believe him because they have nothing better to go by.

They say that in the land of the blind, a one-eyed man is king. Likewise, in the land of the scripturally ignorant: excessive ignorance aggressively presented is perceived as expertise. Particularly when the assumed expert, the preacher paid to operate the local church, is the cause of the general ignorance in the first place.

*1Timothy 3:3* " Not given to wine, no striker, *not greedy of filthy lucre*; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous;"

*1Timothy 3:8* "Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double tongued, not given to much wine, *not greedy of filthy lucre*;"
That term "not greedy of filthy lucre" also found in Titus 1:7, 1:11 and 1Peter 5:2, is a somewhat exaggerated translation. A more accurate rendering would be "any motivation toward personal financial gain at all above and beyond immediate basic needs". "Greedy" in that scripture, can be defined as "desiring anything beyond that which is required for basic health and wellbeing"; anything beyond what is needed to meet the needs of that particular day.

You will not hear this fact from most preachers because they fail this greed test miserably, but pretend that they have not. This is due to the extreme way that these scriptures are translated and represented in the most widely published Bible versions, which almost paint a picture of a Snidely Whiplash type of villain. They have been worded in this manner for the purpose of lowering the bar of acceptability to the point that almost any preacher can avoid being identified as unqualified. This protects both the preachers, and the trade.

This non-materialistic requirement in 1Timothy 3:3 is stated by the phrase "not greedy of filthy lucre", but it is then underscored in the same verse by the addition of the redundant term "not covetous". Covetousness is usually defined as being of an extreme degree that incites immoral action, but in reality that term "not covetous" indicates a state of discipline having no interest whatsoever in having more worldly comforts or pleasures than that which providence provides at the moment. It is a form of humility in which total acceptance and contentment with current personal circumstances is the rule. As Paul demonstrates in 1Timothy 6:8 "And having food and raiment let us be therewith content.”

In contrast to the way that the above mentioned negative terms have been translated in an extreme manner, the positive nature of the word "blameless" found in Titus 1:6,7; 1Tim 3:2,10, 5:7 is very under-stated in many translations. This English word "blameless" is a very mitigated rendering of the original Greek. This word does not mean that a person merely stays out of jail and maintains an acceptable, civil behavior on par with the society in which he lives.

This word translated as "blameless" in scripture is an emphatic word that means an exemplary, shining, living example of all that a Christian should be: honest, selfless, courageous, humble, faithful, etc.; someone with the self-control and discipline to the degree in which of whom it would be impossible to find a moral fault.
This is the person who has a need in his heart to help others, even if it costs him money to do it; Paul, Peter, Timothy or Titus, for example. It is not someone who is there because he is paid to do the job.

I am getting off on another subject, so I will stop right here. The point is that any preacher for pay, let alone one who actively defrauds through a tithe doctrine, is not even in the same moral ballpark as that which scripture requires.

**Conclusion**

1Timothy 5:17 simply means what it says - give the person the extra respect and honor that they have earned, especially if they are trying to teach you something, and particularly when they are sacrificing their own comfort and personal wants to do it. This act of honoring may, or may not involve providing material goods and/or money if their current need calls for it. This concept of honor certainly does not make money paramount in these situations, however.

There is no secret meaning to this verse. We have many cashless ways to show respect and give honor, even double honor to those we hold in high esteem. Read this scripture without the assumptions and superimposed dollar signs that pro-tithers insert into it, and it is all very simple.

"Living of the Gospel"

As with the "muzzle the ox" scripture 1Corinthians 9, let us quickly examine Paul’s comment in 1Timothy 5:18 a little further, because this concept is foundational, and very important. He states "For the scripture saith, thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And, The laborer is worthy of his reward [hire]."

So, where did God ordain this “reward” that Paul is referring to? What does this reward consist of? This is not in reference to Old Covenant tithe law in any way. This is a term taken from the New Covenant.

As we just mentioned, that statement refers to Matthew 10:10: "and in the self same house abide ye, eating and drinking such things as they have; for worthy is the laborer of his meat". and Luke 10:7 in which Jesus says: “for worthy is the laborer of his hire".
Notice that this is once again, talking about food, drink, and lodging only. “Meat” is Strong’s #5160 which means *food*, plain and simple. When Paul quotes Jesus he uses the word *reward* which is #3408 which means “pay for services” either literally or figuratively. We know from the context Jesus is talking about a payment in the form of food and lodging. “Hire” in Luke 10:7 is also #3408.

So these parallel scriptures equate *food* with *hire* (meaning payment) by using the two different words in the two accounts describing the same event. This basically makes them synonymous and interchangeable for the purposes of our study. It also renders any pro-tithe assertion that the *hire* of God’s workers is supposed to be money, particularly *lots* of money, as being practically impossible.

Someone may flog a dead horse and try to infer from those two passages that the disciples also got paid some cash for their journey, or for personal gain, but this is an assumption without evidence. This would have been violating Jesus’ specific instructions of not carrying a (coin) purse. He even forbade them from accepting gifts of such items as basic clothing, unless it was in immediate need.

In Luke 22:37 Jesus explained that He was prophesied to be counted among the transgressors (spurious religious groups). In order for His followers to qualify, or at least appear as such, Jesus instructed them in verse 22:36 to be found at the time of His arrest carrying food provisions, money, and to be armed, just like the various typical religious cults of the time were.

You might notice that, while they did produce a couple of swords, no one in the group was able to produce any money or food.

There is a perfectly good reason for shunning financial prosperity - You can’t serve God and mammon (wealth, i.e. materialism);

Matthew 6:24 “No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.”

"The lure of easy money attracts a certain type of person. That personality type has no business calling himself a man of God."
Luke 16:13 “No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

And the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things: and they derided him. And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God.”

Notice that these do not say “Ye cannot serve God and mammon, except to a certain degree”, “Except to a middle-to upper-class level”, "unless you are a preacher", or “Therefore let your accountants and financial consultants serve mammon and deal with your money for you, while you concentrate on honing your marketable speaking and preaching skills so you can make even more money”.

The worldliness of money is at the opposite end of the spectrum from the spirituality required of any of us, but especially of a true man of God. In Matthew 13:22, Matt 4:18-19, and Luke 8:14, Jesus explained “He also that received seed among the thorns is he that heareth the word; and the care of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful.”

The lure of easy money attracts a certain type of person. That personality type has no business calling himself a man of God. How can this type of person even truly receive and absorb the Word, let alone convey it to others honestly? That is why you do not see many bankers, investment brokers, or casino owners who have an interest in preaching God’s Word. Except of course for money.

Scripture identifies the reward for preaching the Word of the True God as being treasure in Heaven, not riches on Earth. To a person like this the reward may simply be the satisfaction of being of service to God and to his fellow man (strange concept to some, I know). The reward for doing God’s work should not be in the form of a competing false god (money). Why would God reward a good servant with that which turns His stomach (the abomination of worldliness)? That’s kind of defeating the purpose. It is like rewarding your Eagle Scout for his merit achievement with a bag of dope and a bottle of whiskey.

It appears that the handling of petty cash is allowable only to those who are incorruptible and who can be trusted to use it only as a tool of convenience (John 4:8, 13:29), or (in the event of larger amounts) to help others (Eph 4:28), but it did not nullify the austere nature of the job. A coin purse is not a
temptation to someone with the discipline, maturity, and non-worldly focus of 
true discipleship, and it was therefore allowed with caution, and to a very 
limited degree.

Look at so-called Christian churches today - lots of money, little truth. On 
the other hand, how do you bribe or corrupt a preacher that is detached from 
materialism and who accepts only as much as he can wear on his back or fit into 
his belly? Someone who truly wants nothing more than the basics of life in order 
to do his job?

Paul was a determined, living example of what he preached. 2Corinthians 
10:11 “Let such an one think this, that, such as we are in word by letters when we are absent, 
such will we be also in deed when we are present.”

In other words Paul is saying “you will see when we get there that we live 
what we preach”.

Also, Acts 8:18-24 implies that it is an affront to God to even try to mix 
money with Spiritual things. In this story Simon offered money to receive a 
Spiritual gift, and Peter strongly upbraided him for it. If Simon was so 
chastised for offering money, what would Peter say to profiteers today who 
claim to be Christian, and yet charge (as in fees, dues, or a fraudulent 
mandatory tithe) for Spiritual services? Even if Peter rebuked Simon because 
he discerned that he had a profit motive of his own, it still makes the same 
point as far as our study goes: money is to stay out of the picture of spiritual 
matters. Preaching is not to be commodified for financial gain.

As mentioned earlier - In Acts 28:7-11 Paul was shipwrecked and he 
befriended and healed many of the inhabitants of the area. Of which Paul said: 
“Who also honored us with many honors; and when we departed, they laded us with such things 
as were necessary.”

These people were extremely grateful and thought Paul was a god, if Paul 
wanted riches he could have had some there and then. Yet Paul accepted only a 
reward of necessary things. Why? Simply because that is part of the rules for 
men of God. Why carry suitcases and a money belt when God is going to provide 
your needs as you go?

Render Money Unto Me
Another example of this money-centric, limited-only-by-their-imagination mindset of tithe promoters is their interpretation of Jesus' “Render unto God” statement.

Matt 22:17-21 “Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not? But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? Shew me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny. And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription? They say unto him, Caesar’s. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s.

The pro-tithe account of that scripture goes like this: Since Jesus was talking about a Roman coin, he was talking about money. Since Render unto Caesar meant to give money unto Caesar as he demands it, then Render unto God likewise meant to give money unto God as He demands it, which of course “we all know” is the tithe.

So according to this pro-tithe declaration, love, humility, truth, or prayers are fine, but what God is really looking for is cold hard cash, and He wants you to make sure you give lots of it to Bubba in the pulpit wearing the nice outfit.

Apparently the things of God are not spiritual things, but are financial instruments of some sort.
Chapter 20
The “Kingdom Tax” Canard

Some pro-tithe preachers claim the right to a "Kingdom tax", which they say would be the tithe, citing Romans 13:6-7. 
"Every person is to be in subjection to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except from God, and those which exist are established by God. Therefore whoever resists authority has opposed the ordinance of God; and they who have opposed will receive condemnation upon themselves. For rulers are not a cause of fear for good behavior, but for evil. Do you want to have no fear of authority? Do what is good and you will have praise from the same; for it is a minister of God to you for good. But if you do what is evil, be afraid; for it does not bear the sword for nothing; for it is a minister of God, an avenger who brings wrath on the one who practices evil. Therefore it is necessary to be in subjection, not only because of wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For because of this you also pay taxes, for rulers are servants of God, devoting themselves to this very thing. Render to all what is due them: tax to whom tax is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor."

The overriding theme of this argument is that God’s Kingdom has not really manifested itself here on Earth because not enough people (read that as everyone) are tithing.

It seems the pro-tithe theory is not “Seek the Kingdom, and all this shall be added to you”, (Matt 6:33, Luke 12:31) instead it is “seek the tithe money and the Kingdom will be added to you”. Basically they are saying “I’m from the (Kingdom) government, and I’m here to help you. I will start by taking your tithe money.”

Their rose-tinted visions of a Big Rock Candy Mountain-like Kingdom of God on Earth when everyone tithes; where there is peace in the valley, strawberry fields forever, harmony, liberty and justice for all, or however else they want to portray it, is a blatant lie and a scam on its face. History itself renders this buy-your-utopia concept to be false.

The Roman Catholic Church enforced tithing at the point of a sword for centuries and thus obtained basically full compliance. They also enforced God’s Law as they chose to interpret and invent it.
Yet, instead of having God's Kingdom on Earth, those tithers suffered under corrupt kings, wars, death plagues, high taxes and virtual slavery for all but the highest classes, and this lasted for hundreds of years. As history goes, it is known as the “Dark Ages”, with the fraud of the church tithe being just another curse to add to the others listed.

This enslavement was caused by the love of money, and the bondage was broken only by the truth being exposed to the light of day in the form of Bibles which became available to the common man. Just as Jesus said: "You shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free." This certainly applies today, if you can find the truth.

So then, what is all this pro-tithe bunk about how the country will be delivered from the New World Order police state if everyone “turns to God and tithes”? It is just that: pro-tithe bunk. It is a Kafkaesque preacher-induced pipe dream of promises on one hand, and threats of impending doom on the other; the opiate of false religion doing its thing to stupefy the congregation; a poor man’s Talmud of humanistic rationalization and fantasy that twists and neutralizes the intent of God's Word for the benefit of the controllers (church hierarchy). The very phrase "turn to God and tithe" is a blasphemy and an oxymoron.

Tithing made matters worse in the Dark Ages by empowering a corrupt clique in control of a religious/political system. What makes anyone think that it will be our deliverance this time around?

Oh yes, I forgot: This time around we have preachers we can trust; fearless preachers of integrity who will do the right thing as we pay them to lead us triumphantly into God's Kingdom.

Yeah, right; and then we woke up.

Furthermore, regarding Romans 13, the first question I have to ask is: Who made the preachers the "authority"?

Governments also claim to be this authority spoken of here, so also does the Catholic Church, the Mormons hierarchy, the Moonies leaders, Jehovah Witness top brass, and numerous other Christian denominations and cults of the world, so
get in line. None of them qualifies as any kind of God-ordained true authority, and for the same basic reasons.

It reminds me of playing army as a boy. I would hear: “I get to be general”, “No I do”, “No, I called it first”. It involved about the same amount of scriptural authority and the same childish attitude as these preachers who claim “I get to be the authority!”

I do not see today’s preachers using force of arms to enforce any of God's Law, or even seriously advocating or facilitating such actions. I most certainly do not see the tithe-collecting preachers causing fear or bringing wrath to those that do evil, as this scripture describes. They will of course judge, bully, and abuse hapless members of their congregation, but do not expect them to challenge an ungodly world order, or to ever, ever advocate breaking man's law in order to keep God's Law.

Preachers that tell half-truth stories about their track record of “fighting the system” 10-20 years ago, now (particularly if prosperous) seem to have found a comfort zone and have too much to lose by really rocking the boat or turning the world upside down. The more prosperous they become, the less likely it is that they will use that wealth to fight an evil world system that is providing all the goodies for them.

This is also caused by the controlling nose-ring effect that the 501 (c)3 tax-exempt status puts on them. It all adds up to the creation of the “dumb dogs” of Isaiah 56:10-12 whose bottom line is more money and carefully doled out, but officially approved items of the “truth”.

I have a feeling that, should an individual, a group, or entire class of qualified Christians start performing the two duties of “causing fear” and “bringing wrath” in a just manner, as Phinehas did in Numbers 25:6-9, the money to fund their efforts would start coming out of the woodwork; and it would not be a tithe, but gifts.

In other words, if these preachers got off their butts and set a pure example by taking real, positive leadership action to help others or fight evil, or help the down-trodden, they would have all the money and help they needed to do the job.

Until then, this scripture is kind of a moot point regarding a modern tithe being a tax, since it would obviously apply to men of integrity, strength and
action rather than the crème-puff types that today call themselves "men of God" or "God's anointed", "rulers of Israel", "seers", "Law teachers", "reverends", "Kingdom workers", or any other misleadingly self-titled individuals.

One more thought: even if a preacher did have some kind of legitimized authority, it does not follow that he would have the scriptural right to enrich himself by that position. Even a king is forbidden from increasing his personal wealth through his elevated position (Deut 17:16-17), so what makes the preachers think they can ignore this principle when they claim leadership status? Of course this principle was ignored throughout history. It is certainly ignored by both preachers and those in political positions today.

T-A-X Spells "Tithe"?

Another tale that tithers are familiar with is when tithe-pushing teachers say that "tax" in Romans 13:6-7 is really a cryptic word for the tithe - one tenth of your income. As usual, the scripture does not exist to support their doctrine, so they just pretend that it is there.

Once again, they rely on the premise that Paul is speaking in code.

Once again Paul shows them to be wrong, because he said in 2Corinthians 1:13 that he does not speak with such secret meanings.

Once again they take a self-serving false doctrine and try to impute it to Paul in order for it to have the appearance of legitimacy.

They cite this scripture and say something to the effect that “The Kingdom needs rulers, the rulers are us, and the rulers gotta be paid. They get paid by a tax, and that tax is the tithe.”

This tax that Paul is talking about has to be the tithe, according to the pro-tithe myth, because they say a tithe is the only figure that God ever designated as a tax, and anything other than one tenth of your income is sinful man's rebellion to God's order. This tax of 10% is in effect now, according to their story, and, to paraphrase the gist of it: "if you ever want to look at yourself in a mirror again, and call yourself a Kingdom Christian, you had better start paying it, buddy".

I have to disagree with the circular reasoning of this pro-tithe notion on several grounds.
First, Exodus 30:12-18 stipulates an annual poll tax of one/half sheckel (about a fifth ounce of silver), so their “10% is the only figure ever designated” thesis is a lie right off the bat.

Secondly, the Old Covenant type of society that they are trying to mimic was run by a king who imposed his own taxes of various amounts, and that is what got things done, whether good or bad. I have seen no real record in scripture of Levites pro-actively doing anything major in the way of a reformation or constructive nature without the king, or a true prophet first initiating it.

The words of the very rare true prophets of God fell on the deaf ears of the Levites as well as of the people, and we all know who the chief opponents of Jesus were. Sadly, the pagan Roman government authorities showed a much greater inclination toward justice and fairness toward Jesus, Peter and Paul than the religious leaders of that time did.

Judges 17 sums it up: “In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes.” So where were the Levites to enforce the Law?

Whether it was to tear down the pagan idols or to build or repair the temple, it was either the king, or a motivated individual outside of the religious establishment who got things moving; often against Levitical resistance. Second Chronicles 24 and 2Kings 12 depict a good example, as well as 2Chronicles 34:1-11.

In 2Kings 12 it was King Jehoash who saw to it that the temple was repaired, in spite of the Levites who were stealing money from the project.

Also 1Kings 2:27 says Solomon fired Abiathar from being a priest of God. So who was really in charge back then, the religious system, or the political? Who do you think would really control things now, if we had today’s preachers as our “kingdom rulers”?

Don’t get me wrong – I am not in favor of big government. I am just pointing out the obvious facts of scripture: In the time of the kings, it was political power that got action, while religious authorities could not seem to overcome the inertia of the current status quo. They gave lip service to the Law, but changed for the worse with the degeneration of the popular culture.

"Taxes are generally meant to collect money, taking property as a second choice, and the tithe of God’s Law was meant to collect property (food), with money as the second choice."
Many people do not realize that the Baal priests and other infamous pagan idolatry-conducting individuals were almost always turn-coat Levites and Aaronite priests. They had the grooming for service to the True God of Israel, and readily applied those skills and mannerisms to provide a good hocus-pocus show for the pagan religions. A leadership role in the administering of any religion has never been a reliable indication of the devoutness of that person to that religion, particularly if they are holding paid positions.

Bad as political power was, it at least had the ability to reform and repent from time to time, and certain kings took the initiative in doing so. The Levitical class then followed suit; sometimes willingly, sometimes not.

Today it is you, oh king and priest, the average Christian who has that power and responsibility to create change for the better, because you will be waiting forever if you expect someone else to do it for you.

Thirdly, Paul did not say "For because of this you also pay tithes", or "Render to all what is due them: tithe to whom tithe is due". Paul said "TAX", probably because he meant tax, and not tithe. This leads me to think that Paul was talking about some kind of TAX; contrary to what pro-tithers would like us to read into this scripture.

A tax can be any amount, it can be changed as circumstances demand (a war, or a new highway, for examples) and you are not spitting in God's eye (as the pro-tithe preacher asserts), by imposing a tax of anything other than 10%. That is because a tax is a tax, and the tithe was the tithe. Taxes are generally meant to collect money, taking property as a second choice, and the tithe of God's Law was meant to collect property (food), with money as the second choice. They are two separate things, for two different purposes.

As we covered earlier, pagan religions and secular governments imposed tithes and ten percent taxes for various reasons, so there is nothing particularly moral or godly in itself about this figure of one tenth.

The pro-tithers, as usual, read into this chapter what they want you to believe is in there: that this word tax was a secret code word for tithe. They attempt to create Paul's endorsement of their scheme to palm it off as being God's Law - once again "teaching as doctrine the commandments of men".
Nehemiah 10:32 describes a self imposed tax for the upkeep of the temple, and it is a flat rate of a third of a shekel, no doubt based on Exodus 30, and similar to the tax that Jesus and Peter paid (Matt 17:24-27). Ezra was very happy to accept not only freewill gifts from King Artaxerxes and his advisors, but also the king’s civil authority for Ezra and his men to enforce God’s Law with criminal punishment for offenders. No ten percent “tax” involved here at all, and again we see that it was the king and not the religious authorities who supplied the enforcement power.

Second Kings 15:20 describes a special assessment of Israel’s wealthy, in order to pay off an invading army, that was not 10% either. Solomon commandeered or bought all kinds of supplies to build the temple; in fact every tabernacle or temple building project described in scripture was funded through freewill giving, not tithe (Exodus 25:1-9, 35:4-9, 35:21-29, 1Chronicles 29:3-9, 17, 2Chronicles 24:4-14, Ezra 2:68-69).

Pro tithe preachers also confuse matters by saying that the tithe was a tax (which by definition is not voluntary), but then when confronted with scripture they flip-flop and say it was a voluntary offering; but then again, they say you have to pay it to “acknowledge the sovereignty of God”. A subject which we now know is a red herring of the same magnitude as the “God-robbing” hoax.

When I first sent out my basic concerns about the modern church tithe to a few men for review and opinions, one response I got from a tithe-receiving elder and would-be ruler in the Kingdom is basically that "The tithe is a voluntary offering. There is no obligation to pay it, or scripturally defined power to enforce it".

So they present it as a “the law of the tithe”, but when faced with facts, they can only waffle out a description of a suggestion of the tithe.

Ask yourself, dear reader, if the tithe has not been presented to you time after time by preachers as being obligatory and under various badassical threats of God’s curse for not doing so. Also ask yourself if any failure to pay this 10% surcharge on life is not represented as being shameful, “robbing God”, anti-Kingdom, anti-Law, anti-Christian, etc. Does any of this sound “voluntary”?

I mean, that is the whole idea of this false doctrine in the first place - to coerce money out of people using God as their alleged enforcer or “hit man”.
Let me make this perfectly clear: A tithe was always mandatory to those whom it applied, and who wished to remain in good standing in the Mosaic Covenant community; while freewill gifts were voluntary.

Tithing was just as “voluntary” as a thief making voluntary reparations of four times what he stole. He did not have to repay the judgment amount, but woe to those who did not fulfill this expectation. The tithe was a mandatory offering, failure of which to perform incurred at minimum a social stigma and disassociation from the devout Israelite society, and probably an expulsion from the temple congregation.

Anyone using an invented oxymoronic term like “voluntary tithe” is once again using doublespeak and deception by blurring the scriptural distinction between requirement of tithing and the option of willful giving.

Just as it is with other scriptures that pro-tithers bring up to try to make their point, Romans 13 is evidence that indicates the opposite of what they are saying is true.

If you read Romans 13:6-7 for what it says, it is clear that a Christian dominated society, if it had a government at all, was expected to be funded by a tax and not a tithe. The examples of early Christian colonies in this country – often cited as being the closest thing to a fulfilled physical Kingdom of God on Earth to exist after the First Century – bear out the fact that taxes, not tithing were imposed to fund the civil body politic; even though they governed by using God's Law in other areas of criminal justice.

Those taxes were nowhere near 10%, but even if they were exactly 10% that would not have made them a Biblical tithe, any more than the Egyptian 10% tax on foreigners was.

To my knowledge the Pilgrims and other early colonial Kingdom Christian types did not hold to a church tithe at all, let alone to run their local government on. In fact, one of the reasons they left England was because of a forced tithe there. That is a well established fact of history.

Besides all that, Jesus said in Matt 17:25-26 to paraphrase: "tax the aliens, the children are free", so you can decide for yourself which of those two Kingdom categories you fit into. Seems to me that paying a "Kingdom tax" looks
a lot like an admission of alien status, and that Yahweh God is not your father. Hebrews 12:8 uses the word *bastards* in discussing a very similar subject.

**Scriptural Authority**

As long as we’re on Romans 13 and the subject of authority, and “who gets to be general”, let’s examine the scriptures to get our facts straight.

1 Corinthians 11:3 “But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.”

Scripture is often very simple, as this verse demonstrates. You would have to be a seminary graduate to mess this one up. Do you see your preacher or pastor in that itemized chain of command? As spiritual matters go, we answer directly to Christ the Judge, not Joe Schmoe who was a rodeo clown last year but is now your authority or ruler because he decided to be a preacher or “Law teacher”.

It does not matter how nice and personable, or how pious and superior he acts at gatherings, or what knowledge he claims to have that you do not. Eventually you will find that much of what your preacher/seer/prophet/Law-teacher has been telling you is error or fiction anyway. This myth they have concocted about the tithe is a quintessential example.

“1 Peter 5:3 says to teach and minister to others “willingly, readily, without payment of money, without assuming authority over them, but leading by example.”

Do not get me wrong – Anyone should be given the chance to preach, teach, or otherwise present what they feel led to. That is the basis of a true Christian gathering, and all Christians should really have some experience in doing it. They should however, then be ready in the same forum to answer questions and defend the points they have offered.

This does not make the speaker any kind of authority over the listeners, whether it is their first or five-hundredth presentation, and it certainly does not entitle him to a tenth of anyone’s income. The privilege is granted in having the floor to speak, after all, not in being allowed to listen.
You can submit to the authority and control of whoever you want to – priest, preacher, guru, psychiatrist, government, mob boss, pimp, or bully down the street; but it is all by your choice, not because they are somehow entitled to it. None of these are necessarily Godly or even in your own best interest to submit to any more than the others are. Remember this however: No person has authority over you that you have not first chosen to grant to them. That is why other people are missing from Paul's statement of hierarchy.

Do not forget: the preachers make their living and hold their control through the notion that the congregation needs them; that they need the so-called special knowledge, the spiritual understanding, or the anointing that is implied or outright claimed by the preachers to have, and congruent with that goes the self-proclaimed authority.

If they have to, they may just make stuff up to be interesting; to impress the congregation; to be the "Art Bell of Christian radio", as one preacher put it. This so-called advanced insight is very often our old friend sophistry again at work; plain old scripture-twisting BS fortified with showmanship having the aim of creating sensationalism, or the mystical illusion of spiritual insight and preacher authority, at the expense of truth.

A true teacher's goal and great joy is to get their students to achieve and then surpass the knowledge of the teacher, so that knowledge advances with each generation. A commercial preacher's objective is create repeat customers for life; those who become clones of the preacher's personal ideology but who never achieve his level of "knowledge" because as is often the case, he makes it up as he goes along.

These are the people that 2Timothy 3:7 describes as "ever learning, but never coming to a realization of the truth."

In stark contrast to the ego-freak authoritarian preachers of today, scriptural examples such as Paul or Peter would minister to others by teaching people about their own authority and liberty so they could grow up to be mature Christians and in turn teach others. True leaders create more leaders, not just followers. Strong leaders, like true teachers, take joy in seeing growth in those they lead; particularly in those who excel in knowledge and ability beyond the leader himself.
Weak leaders, no matter what kind of false persona they create, are perpetually afraid of the growth potential of those they allegedly lead and therefore prefer to keep them subjugated in a smaller “fishbowl” and dependent on the preachers for so-called spirit inspired weekly sermons, approved guidance, and doctrinally correct instruction. They apparently want to see some level of growth, but they do not want anyone to outgrow the need to be fed by a preacher.

For those who do not know – A goldfish will only grow to a size proportionate to its environment. An eight inch bowl might grow a fish an inch long and no more. If that fish is placed in a ten gallon tank it might grow to three inches and then stop; and if put into a lake that same fish might grow to two feet long or more.

People are subjected to intellectual and spiritual fishbowls by various authorities every day, and again, these are not necessarily put in place for our benefit, but for the advantage of those who seek authority and control.

By God’s apparent plan, the teachings of Jesus and the resulting New Covenant Kingdom and perfect Law of Liberty (Galatians 5:13, James 1:25) were a fishbowl-breaking series of fortunate events which originally freed the Early Christians from the tyranny of false dogmas and corruption of bogus authorities. Most of establishment religion has ignored, marginalized, or successfully negated the original Christian teachings through false doctrines.

Second Corinthians 1:24, “Not that we have dominion over your faith, but are fellow workers for your joy; for by faith you stand.”

Some translations use terms like “we are not dictators over your faith…”

1Peter 5:3 says to teach and minister to others “willingly, readily, without payment of money, without assuming authority over them, but leading by example.”

Obviously Peter or Paul could never successfully run a modern day church corporation, evangelistic cd ministry business, world-wide radio enterprise, or be an effective Kingdom worker with those kinds of silly old fashioned ideas, would they? Read those scriptures again. Count yourself lucky if you know a preacher that is anywhere near fitting either of those instructive descriptions.

In 2Corinthians 11:20 Paul derides the people for their foolish behavior regarding their submission to authoritarian false preachers: “For you bear with anyone if he enslaves you [If you do not agree with the preacher, you are a “snake”,}
or “son of the devil”, “heretic”, “apostate”, etc], if he devours you [some translations: “lives at your expense”], if he takes advantage of you [expects you to follow his orders], if he exalts himself [calls himself a “ruler of Israel”, “prophet”, “father”, “Law Teacher”, “God’s anointed”, “seer”, “reverend”, etc], if he hits you in the face.” [No comment].

First Corinthians 4:6-15 condemns self-importance, and encourages humility and patience. In 4:15 Paul points out that worldly preachers are a dime a dozen, but that a true man of God is scarce. In 1Corinthians 4:21 he implies that arrogance in a preacher is worthy of a beating with a stick.

I do not know about every preacher in the world, but all of the tithe-promoting preachers that I have ever known personally also have problems with the “Little Caesar Syndrome” of arrogance, conceit, and elevated sense of self-importance that these scriptures clearly instruct against. I am suggesting that tithe promoting actually requires this type of personality in a preacher, and that it is just the tip of the iceberg of numerous character flaws that disqualify these people from even holding positions as legitimate Christian preachers or teachers to begin with.

The Kingdom Tithe

Of the preachers that espouse this “tithe is a tax” angle, there is a sub-group that claim that this is really a “Kingdom Tithe” that is required to re-establish and maintain God’s physical Kingdom here on Earth, and that the tithe is meant to fund not just the church business, but the entire governmental infrastructure. As such, the income-tithe would be the only tax that anyone would ever have to pay.

Of this tax, one tenth would go to preachers (which equates the modern day preachers to the Aaronic priests of old), and the rest be used to pay judges, maintain roads, and everything else needed to keep society in good running order.

Since the government at all levels could easily be funded this way once we got rid of the mega-parasites (such as the Federal Reserve banking system, military-industrial interests, mind-boggling corruption, and multitude of special
interest-driven government mandates) this aspect of tithing garners some favorable interest.

Unfortunately it is not a very realistic or even relevant argument regarding the tithe issue. It is a diversionary ploy - a man-made concept that plays on one of the inner-most desires of good Christians, and that is to have a clean, righteous, uncorrupted society. Alas, this utopian diorama painted by the pro-tithers has no connection to scripture or Biblical history at all. It is intended to be the brass ring - the carrot on a stick that looks so good but is just out of reach, and will always be so. There are several reasons why:

First: The tithe of scripture was agricultural in nature, and had the limited purpose of feeding a certain group of people who were to teach Law and judge disputes. It was, by no stretch of the imagination, meant to run a fully functioning government on, once the position of an Earthly king was established. It's a nice dream though.

The various other ancient governmentally imposed tithes, on the other hand, had nothing to do with religious activities, unless a king at his own discretion specifically designated funds for such purposes.

Other cultures could use tithing to fund whatever they wanted to, but the Israelite culture was limited to the definitions laid down in God’s Law.

Secondly: This doctrine unduly elevates and emphasizes the role of money in a Kingdom paradigm, while it diminishes the spirituality and real power of the New Covenant down to the level of worldly materialism. It decries any resemblance to that which Jesus taught.

"If it is money that determines who wins this game, then we have already lost the war, and you can kiss your burro goodbye."
This is all assuming that the preacher would really even apply any money toward a stated goal if large sums of cash were to start pouring in, without first providing for himself a lavish lifestyle and a golden parachute.

Once a problem is targeted or a project started, it would have a much better chance of success if the people have some extra money in their pocket to contribute, rather than having had it bled off beforehand in the form of tithes to a preacher.

Two very applicable adages to remember are “God helps those who help themselves.” And “God favors the bold” (when seeking righteousness).

I mean, Jesus said “these things and greater shall you do”, he did not point to the moneychangers and say “these scams and more shall you pull”, or “This wealth and more shall you collect in My name” or anything else indicating that money had anything more than a low level utilitarian role in the Kingdom.

These pro-tithe, pro-physical-Kingdomists have apparently missed the whole point of the Bible’s non-materialistic message.

There is a lot to be said for prosperity, peace on Earth, and physical health and freedom, but I do not see where the scriptures say that money is going to achieve it; particularly money given to preachers.

How much would it cost today to engineer and physically replicate the parting of the Red Sea? How much did it cost the ancient Israelites?

How much would it cost to rent wrecking balls to demolish the walls of Jericho? How much did it cost Joshua?

How many billions of dollars did it cost the US taxpayer to destroy the people and army of Iraq? What did it cost to kill 185,000 Assyrians in one night (2Kings 19:35)?

What does it cost today to cure terminal cancer or blindness through modern commercial medicine, if they can even do it? How much did Jesus charge for such works? In fact Jesus attributed those healings to the faith of the people that were healed. So what other power might be available to us if only we had truly spiritual preachers as guides to unlocking these possibilities?

I think you see the point. Money means nothing when compared to the supernatural power to alter what we know as physical reality. We might have had a better grip on understanding how to accomplish this if our so-called
spiritual leaders were not so preoccupied with chasing a buck for themselves, and idolizing money as being the solution to all our problems.

Much like politicians, these preachers seem prone to blame their own failures on not having enough money. In reality it is a matter of a lack of scriptural qualifications and of having the wrong priorities. Their priority of seeking money even paints some of them as being closet mammon-worshippers. Scripture instructs us to reject such people from fellowship, let alone as preachers in the first place.

Thirdly, the tithe-as-tax concept demonstrates the half-baked, hypocritical nature of the whole pro-tithe thought process.

Namely, they admit that in their Kingdom paradigm only one tenth of the tithe is supposed to go to preachers. The rest is supposed to go to the Christian ruling establishment (Dominion Government) under this plan of theirs. Yet, we have seen almost no inclination to do anything politically or socially constructive with the money they do currently get. They just seem to absorb it all somehow. Helping the poor is apparently not a big priority for them. In fact I think you will find that those preachers and church corporations who promote a tithe are also not big on supporting any charitable causes in any major way, other than themselves. That is because promoting a false doctrine for personal enrichment indicates a greedy and self-centered personal nature. In my experience, greedy, self-centered people who want others to be generous givers are not generous givers themselves, no matter how great the need of others becomes.

One preacher was proud of his claim that he gave 5% of the tithe money that he got to the poor. Apparently this is better than most.


Regarding other aspects of civil government that require funding - are these preachers contributing to maintaining roads or parks or fire departments as their paradigm would indicate? Of course not, even though any government entity will gladly accept cash gifts to help fund its expenses if these tithe-collecting preachers were to offer it.
So the obvious question is: Why should these preachers get the full tithe when they, by their own admission, have only a tenth of the tithe coming to them, seeing as how they are not providing any governmental services as their proclaimed “Christian-dominion, God’s Kingdom” plan would indicate? Why don’t they just demand a tenth of the tithe for themselves, and then a full tithe later when that tithe money is actually going to provide civil services?

The only answer that I have heard from them is basically “Because you are supposed to. Paying a full tithe is good practice for you until the day that the Kingdom actually does manifest itself”.

Since the preachers themselves state that they should be getting only one tenth of the tithe according to their own paradigm, they are in effect admitting to stealing 90% of the tithe which they are not entitled to. In other words by their own definition they are God-robbers and congregation-robbers, and not one bit ashamed of themselves for doing so.

If they really believe in this “Kingdom Dominion” paradigm, why are they not giving away 90% of their tithe receipts, so they will be all practiced up for “the day when the Kingdom actually does manifest itself”, just as they want the tithe givers to be?
Chapter 21
Kinda Similar, Sorta Sounds Like...

With this “sorta sounds like” argument, we have pro-tithers trying their best to have us suspend disbelief, and identify Paul’s writings as not actually speaking about a tithe, but as "having a similarity" to Old Covenant Scriptures that (almost) refer to the tithe. The idea is that Paul is not really talking about what he is saying, but is instead, once again, talking about tithing by using words that actually mean something other than what they say. Let's take a look.

In this case a preacher would quote something like Acts 11:29-30 “Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judaea: Which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.”

Or 1Corinthians 16:2 - "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.”

These both refer to a situation in which Paul was directing a collection effort aimed at providing food and necessities for the destitute brethren in Jerusalem.

The preacher points out how the language in that verse is “practically identical” to the “tithing” language in Deuteronomy 16:16-17 “Three times in a year shall all thy males appear before the LORD thy God in the place which he shall choose; in the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of tabernacles: and they shall not appear before the LORD empty: Every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the LORD thy God which he hath given thee.”

The preacher’s conclusion is that Paul did not bother to use the word “tithe” because he was employing obvious “tithe language”. The preacher reasons that these people almost certainly knew that Paul was talking about the tithe because the Corinthians spoke Greek, and the Septuagint was written in Greek, so there you go and Bob’s your uncle; What more connection could you want?

The fact is, however, that these people were practically all pagans and knew no more about the Septuagint, than Christians today know about the Bhagavad-Gita. There is no reason whatsoever to assume that these people automatically made a mental connection between Paul’s request for donations, and a Levitical tithe.
In a similar instance, the preacher would compare this verse to something like Deuteronomy 16:10 “And thou shalt keep the feast of weeks unto the LORD thy God with a tribute of a freewill offering of thine hand, which thou shalt give unto the LORD thy God, according as the LORD thy God hath blessed thee” or 16:17 "Every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the LORD your God which He has given you."

These two scriptures are also talking about a feast day offering. So it is willful, voluntary giving that is the subject here, and not a tithe.

According to the alleged logic, some people brought their offerings to the feast day events, and other people brought their tithes to these events as well. Therefore it is “obvious” that when Paul is describing freewill offerings in 1Corinthians 16 he is really surreptitiously talking about tithes. That is because, they say, since both tithes and offerings were taking place at the same Old Covenant feast day event, that fact apparently makes the two activities synonymous with each other in the mind of the pro-tithe preacher. They make this claim, notwithstanding the fact that tithing is not mentioned anywhere near Deuteronomy 16, or any other scripture that they bring up to support their “kinda, sorta, sounds like” argument.

The preacher then rationalizes something like this: "Notice how Paul's words 'as he may prosper' is nearly identical to 'give as he is able' or 'according as the LORD thy God hath blessed thee’. Therefore Paul was clearly referring back to the Old Testament Law of tithing when he used 'tithe language' like this".

So therefore, according to the pro-tithe myth, Paul is obviously teaching the validity of a tithe by using secret code words that really mean tithe, but do not actually say “tithe” or even describe the act of tithing.

Translation:

Let me rephrase this argument from the pro-tithe point of view, but in a realistic manner:

"Keep in mind that Paul does not refer to any Old Covenant verse in this scripture at all; he is simply asking for donations to the cause of helping starving Christians."
• Paul’s *secret code words* are used in a context and situation which specifically describes *freewill giving* and not tithing.

• In the process of doing so he uses words that have only a *vague similarity*, if any, to an Old Covenant scripture from Deuteronomy which *also* described freewill giving at a feast day event, and which also has no mention of a tithe.

• The freewill giving referred to, took place at an event where tithing as a separate and unrelated occurrence was probably but not necessarily taking place. (Just as animal sacrifices were. — my comment)

• By doing this, Paul supposedly provides the nexus of evidence that he is very cleverly teaching the Levitical tithe to these Greek pagans through an esoteric means of subtle inferences that no one but a mind-reader would catch wind of.

This is a sub-rosa manner of teaching in which the pagans would have had to have had a very thorough, intimate knowledge of Old Covenant scriptures and feast events to *even have a clue* as to what Paul might have been secretly talking about, let alone having the paranormal ability required to make the mental leap that the tithe was the real subject waiting for them at the end of this rainbow.

This pro-tithe position requires us to assume that Paul had gone totally mad just before he wrote 1Corinthians 16, but then recovered his senses by the time he got to verse 17.

Paul was the Apostle to the ten-tribed dispora, don’t forget; the *gentiles* (Eph 3:18). These were *pagans* that Paul was talking to, which was Paul’s primary, if not *exclusive* mission. What would those people know or care about Judean religious history or culture? So this begs the question: Why would Paul make vague references to a foreign religious practice of freewill giving, in order to remind his audience of another unmentioned foreign practice of Levitical tithing, of which these pagans had no knowledge in the first place?

The answer is: He didn’t. The whole absurd scenario is made up by pro-tithe preachers for the purpose of gaining wealth for themselves.

This whole pro-tithe line of thinking that pagans intuitively latched on to a tithe inference about a generally unfamiliar foreign religion is totally intellectually indefensible. I mean, think about it: We have the Old Covenant
and the New, all bound into one Bible, all in English and often cross-referenced. With all these advantages, we still cannot honestly make any of the connections that the tithe promoters try to foist upon their listeners. So how could we expect the pagans of Greece to make any sense of Paul's allegedly cryptic, secret-code-word-laced messages, if that was in fact the case?

And what are some of the code words that Paul used about other subjects? If he supposedly used esoteric meanings about the tithe, he must have used them when talking about other subjects as well; right? Or is the tithe subject the one and only topic that Paul ran through the message scrambler before it was sent out?

Keep in mind that Paul does not refer to any Old Covenant verse in this scripture at all; he is simply asking for donations to the cause of helping starving Christians. It is the pro-tithers who have created this thought of a “similarity” and inserted it into the context of Paul’s writings. Since they could not even find Old Covenant tithe scriptures to suit their purposes, the Old Covenant scriptures on willful giving quoted above are the closest thing they could come up with, and they made up the difference with pure, unmitigated deception.

The same pro-tithe preacher also approaches 2Corinthians 8:8 through the end of chapter nine: he says that while these two chapters “could” be talking about freewill giving, Paul is instead primarily talking about a tithe because of the “tithe language” in 2Corinthians 8:12 “…it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not.”

According to the tale, Paul’s “tithe language” comes right from Deuteronomy 16:17 “Every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the LORD thy God which he hath given thee.”

So, what can I say? There’s really nothing for us to discuss here because Deuteronomy 16 is talking about feast-time offerings, not tithe. There is no tithe mentioned in the entire chapter. Not even a “poor tithe”. Both the Old and New Covenant scriptures that pro-tithers compare are talking about
voluntary, self-determined, freewill giving. The tithe aspect does not exist in either scripture.

The concept of a tithe is totally contrived, and inserted into the context by the pro-tithers; coming right out of left field like Planet X appearing out of another dimension - the preacher just plain made it up as an excuse to have the illusion of another “New Covenant tithe scripture” in place, because they cannot find valid scriptures to support a legitimate, intelligent argument.

In case you missed it, allow me to repeat:

• Paul is instructing freewill giving, not tithing, and he does not reference any Old Covenant scripture in doing so.
• The Old Covenant scriptures selected and linked to First and Second Corinthians are done so by the pro-tithe promoters only, not by Paul.
• The Old Covenant scriptures that they identify are not speaking about a tithe at all; they clearly describe freewill giving.
• The concept of a tithe or “tithe language” existing anywhere in the New Covenant is entirely, entirely made up and inserted into those scriptures and force-fed to the listeners through pre-meditated preacher-babel deception.

Ephesians 5:6 "Let no one deceive you with empty words, for because of these things the wrath of God comes upon the sons of disobedience."

Colossians 2:4 "I say this so that no one will delude you with persuasive argument."

Colossians 2:8 "See to it that no one takes you captive through philosophy and empty deception, according to the tradition of men, according to the elementary principles of the world, rather than according to Christ."

But wait, there's more...

Leaving no truffle unsnuffled, the preacher continues with 1Corinthians 16:2 "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.”

The preacher specifically calls attention to the word “store” in that verse, and explains how that is translated from Strong's #2343, which is derived from #2344, which means “a deposit; wealth, either literally or figuratively".
According to the preacher it is “perhaps” a reference to “storehousing”, and the revealing and astonishing thing is - #2344 is the same word used in the Septuagint version of Malachi 3:10 “storehouse”. Of course we know that Malachi was talking about filling the storehouse with tithed stuff.

That preacher’s point apparently is that this word “store”, (which is not really the word we should be dealing with, but is actually derived from the word which) means “a deposit of literal or figurative wealth”, and that this word is exclusively reserved for any discussion of the tithe, simply because this preacher says so.

The fact that The Septuagint uses this word #2344 in Malachi is a confirmation that food was considered a form of wealth, and that the context of scriptures referring to “wages” or “payment” did not necessarily mean that they were talking about money.

As a side note: Researching words in Strong’s Concordance can be very beneficial to understanding what is being said. However, any time someone treats a word as if it has the same meaning as the word that it is derived from - beware: your Spidey-sense should begin to tingle. Different words are different for a purpose. Different words have different meanings - sometimes vastly different than the word they are derived from. If the scripture writers had wanted to use the parent word instead of the word that they chose, they would have written that word instead of the word they chose. The word-switching technique used in this case is a very common means of scriptural diversion and deception.

In this case the difference in the two different words is not a big issue. The chicanery comes from switching the words for the purpose of creating a fictional connection between 1Corinthians 16:2 and Malachi 3:10 to give the illusion of some kind of tithe inference by Paul.

Not yet finished, this same pro-tither points out 2Corinthians 9:7-11 “Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver.

And God is able to make all grace abound toward you; that ye, always having all sufficiency in all things, may abound to every good work:
(As it is written, He hath dispersed abroad; he hath given to the poor: his righteousness remaineth for ever. Now he that ministereth seed to the sower both minister bread for your food, and multiply your seed sown, and increase the fruits of your righteousness;)

Being enriched in every thing to all bountifulness, which causeth through us thanksgiving to God.”

As we can see in clear, plain language, Paul is speaking about having a sufficiency of material goods remaining even after the freewill giving has taken place. That is, having enough to get by on and thrive; not giving with the intent of somehow getting back much more than you gave. Paul also speaks of spiritual blessings and glory to God.

Nevertheless, the pro-tither emphasizes that this is “essentially the same language” as Malachi 3:10 “Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the LORD of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it.”

This scripture is commonly portrayed by pro-tithers as meaning “oodles and oodles of wealth”, which is an entirely different concept than what Paul was talking about.

Since Malachi is referencing the tithe, the outcome-based tithe logic continues that Paul’s “tithe language” therefore affirms that he was talking about tithing in these two chapters as well, simply because he used the word “store”. This claim is made, notwithstanding the fact that this scripture is clearly describing freewill giving to those in need. They also seem to assume as fact the notion that the only way that a person can gain a material blessing is by tithing, not through generosity to others.

This is another example of how they constantly intertwine the tithe misnomer with freewill giving scriptures in an effort to deliberately destroy the distinction that scripture places between the two.

The pro-tithe line of thinking about Paul's assumed crypto-tithe writings ignores the facts of what the scriptures themselves say when they quote them.

This far-fetched, silly attempt appears to be a desperate effort to make connections that are not there; not even close to being there. It is bizarre, but not surprising.

It is a strange technique that does not appear to be applied to any subject other than the tithe. That preacher is not alone in using this “similar language”
tactic. It is misused multiple times in the pro-tithe campaign; too many times for it to be an accident or well-intentioned error. These are a few of the various pro-tithe talking points that become memes because they are used, re-used, circulated, and recycled over and over again by the tithe promoters.

For example something like “Malachi 3:10 ‘sounds a lot like’ Isaiah 62:14 and ‘much like’ Deuteronomy 28, and we all know that the blessings and cursing of that chapter are still valid, ‘so therefore it stands to reason’ that the tithe is still valid as well”.

Yet another example is 2Chronicles 31:4 “Moreover he commanded the people that dwelt in Jerusalem to give the portion of the priests and the Levites, that they might be encouraged in the law of the LORD.”

This supposedly kinda, sorta, sounds like Acts 6:2-4 “Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples unto them, and said, It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business.

But we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word.”

The preacher, in a “fete accompli” tactic (pretending that his assertion is an accomplished fact) concludes that the connection between these scriptures “demand” that New Covenant preachers be paid.

The world is full of demands I guess, anything to get their knickers in a twist; but these scriptures are not demanding anything. They are simply stating what happened in two entirely unrelated stories. The only “demand” that I see here is from the preacher for you to shut down your brain while they fabricate a connection that is so inane it could be debunked by a home-schooled third grader.

As a side note: A well established piece of knowledge is that those who allow nonsense into their minds, increase their own nonsensicality. It is said that you are the average of the five people that you surround yourself with the most. Your preacher, good or bad, becomes part of who you are. 1Corinthians 15:33 "Bad company corrupts good morals".

Anyone listening to, and accepting this "similar language" absurdity is getting their common sense sucked right out of their minds in weekly increments with asinine preaching such as this.
"You can fool some of the people all of the time - and those are the ones that you want to concentrate on" - attributed to G.W. Bush

The Grown-Ups' View

Contrary to the preacher's "kinda, sorta, sounds like" conclusion, the reality is that Second Chronicles 31:4 is talking about food only, and for Levites only. This was just as it should be and as God had directed. Levites with their basic nutritional needs met, and they could then operate the temple and teach God's Law. What else would we expect? That's exactly what the tithe was meant for.

Acts 6:2-4 on the other hand, is talking about a case of leading by example, delegating authority, and assigning volunteers to help with some of the more mundane works of charity. Look at what this scripture is telling us: The Apostles were personally serving in some kind of soup kitchen for the poor; which was one of the basic activities of their movement - helping others in need. They could not handle the workload themselves, so they did the logical thing and had others carry on with these efforts while the Apostles did other things that required their personal attention. This only makes sense.

Second Chronicles 31:4 and Acts 6:2-4 are two totally different situations. In one, we have people tithing food (basic sustenance) so the Levites could study and teach; in the other we have Apostles learning to manage their time, while they train up new leaders by starting them with food service duties; expecting no one to do anything that they themselves would not do.

But according to pro-tithers, we are supposed to believe that Peter was looking for money in Acts 6; tithe money to be precise. The mental connection we are supposed to make is that if Peter was looking for money, then it must be OK for your preacher chase a buck as well.

It is a case of a person of low moral character slandering a person of upright character (the Apostle Peter), in order to justify the immoral lifestyle of the slanderer.

The problem for the pro-tithe slanderers however, is that neither scripture is talking about money at all, and with absolutely no implications of a tithe in any form in Acts. Their "kinda, sorta sounds like" allegation connecting Peter's
request for volunteer help, to a scripture about tithe for Levites is once again, absolute fiction and deception.

The Power of Association

This argument of theirs is another case of pro-tithe preachers taking a great Biblical figure, in this case Peter, and attempting to associate their unclean tithe doctrine with him; hoping that some of his legitimacy will somehow rub off onto their illegitimate program. This is a common propaganda and advertising technique. In this case it is kind of like using Einstein’s image, not to sell Apple computers, but instead using it to promote Nuttie-Fuddies or Coco-Puffs.

These “kinda, sorta, sounds like” examples expose some of the fanciful pro-tithe mindset and what they consider “valid reasoning” as to why people should tithe. This type of faux deduction process may fly with some listeners, but only until an adult enters the room and shows it for what it is.

When the magic of professional presentation and oratorical devices are stripped away, and the concept is explained in plain black and white on paper, the kinda, sorta sounds like idea looks exactly like what it is. You can call it nonsense, hogwash, or perhaps predatory deception; call it what you will, just do not call it anything even close to the truth, or integrity, or honest preaching.

Leviticus 19:29 19:11 “Ye shall not steal, neither deal falsely, neither lie one to another”.

First Corinthians 1:17 “For Christ did not send me to baptize, but to preach the gospel, not in cleverness of speech, so that the cross of Christ would not be made void.”

First Corinthians 4:6 “Now these things, brethren, I have figuratively applied to myself and Apollos for your sakes, so that in us you may learn not to exceed what is written, so that no one of you will become arrogant in behalf of one against the other.”

That is a perfect description of preachers and how they split off from each other, thus dividing the Body of Christ based on their own personal little dogmas based on faulty reasoning.
**First Corinthians 3:19**  “For the wisdom of this world is foolishness before God For it is written, ‘He is the one who catches the wise in their *craftiness*’ “.

**First Corinthians 1:19**  “For it is written, ‘I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the cleverness of the clever I will set aside.’” *(from Isaiah 29:14)*

OK, OK, so these pro-tithers are *not* really clever, or wise, or crafty, because their efforts are so obvious and childishly done. The point is that they apparently *try their best to be* clever in their deceptive efforts to convince you to fund them and to persuade you to believe their various self-made doctrines.

They also do their best to be *crafty*, and in my opinion they are also *adding to God’s Word* and *exceeding what is written* when they play these base little manipulated word games and fizzled attempts at spell casting; i.e. making connections that do not exist; telling you that scripture says something that it does not say. It appears that these tithe promoters are not only false teachers, but they also make incompetent villains.

Considering the fact that not only is the tithe a specific amount of ten percent and that it was also a mandatory obligation, and considering that neither of these characteristics of the Law can be found in New Covenant writings; this *sounds sorta similar* doctrine was not a natural conclusion to come to. Instead it took a deliberate, pre-meditated effort to *create bogus evidence out of thin air* in support of a desired conclusion. All of this taking place when honest scriptural evidence that contradicts their conclusion could readily be found, but was ignored.

As they say: "A truth untold is a lie". In this case I will have to coin my own phrase to state the obvious: *A lie told is a lie*.

For instance, why did the preacher ignore 1*Corinthians 9:7*  “Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give;”? *This indicates the same type of willful giving language* as that which was also used in Exodus 35:5, 21-26,29; Ezra 2:68-69; and 1*Chronicles 29:3-9*. They are all clearly non-tithe. It appears that the pro-tithe preacher wanted to conceal or obfuscate as much as possible the *freewill giving* message that Paul was expressing. This evidence shoots down in flames any theory that Paul was talking about a tithe here *at all*. 
Attempted Cleverness vs. Accomplished Fact

Let's take a responsible look at those same scriptures that are claimed to kinda, sorta sound like something else. When we read Acts 11:29 and 1Corinthians 16:2 and their alleged similar language stated above, we see that Paul is looking for donations, and basically saying "give what you can spare".

What is Paul supposed to say - "Give us what you can’t spare"? "Give us what you don’t have"? "Give us some of your decrease"?

Anything Paul would have said along the lines of "give what you can afford" could be taken by tithe promoters as being "very similar language" to the "give as he is able", or "according to how you’ve been blessed" willful giving quotes from Deuteronomy.

These two scriptures sound similar because both Paul’s writings and Deuteronomy 16 are talking about the same basic thing – freewill giving. They are not talking about tithe at all, which is plain to see to anyone with a 5th grade reading comprehension. The preacher goes on and on about how the two scriptures use “tithe language”, when in fact neither scripture has anything to do with tithing. Yet, he claims they are proof of a New Covenant tithe.

Looking at Deuteronomy 16:10-17

“And thou shalt keep the feast of weeks unto the LORD thy God with a tribute of a freewill offering of thine hand, which thou shalt give unto the LORD thy God, according as the LORD thy God hath blessed thee:

And thou shalt rejoice before the LORD thy God, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maidservant, and the Levite that is within thy gates, and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, that are among you, in the place which the LORD thy God hath chosen to place his name there.

And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt: and thou shalt observe and do these statutes.

Thou shalt observe the feast of tabernacles seven days, after that thou hast gathered in thy corn and thy wine: And thou shalt rejoice in thy feast, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maidservant, and the Levite, the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, that are within thy gates.

Seven days shalt thou keep a solemn feast unto the LORD thy God in the place which the LORD shall choose: because the LORD thy God shall bless thee in all thine increase, and in all the works of thine hands, therefore thou shalt surely rejoice.

Three times in a year shall all thy males appear before the LORD thy God in the place which he shall choose; in the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of
tabernacles: and they shall not appear before the LORD empty:

Every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the LORD thy God which he hath given thee.

These verses state 4 basic things:

- They were to bring freewill offerings (of food items) for The Lord to the feast day event in amounts proportional to what they could afford to do.
- They put it all together into a big pot-luck kitty from which both rich and poor could partake and enjoy the event equally.
- They were to do this at the three designated feast days per year.
- There is no tithe involved in these instructions at all.

Willful giving that this scripture describes is not the same as tithing. The pro-tithers know this, but do their best to blur the lines between the two, and use the confusion to their advantage. The “poor tithe” mentioned earlier is separate and apart from the activity spoken of here.

Pro tithers then make patently false statements about Paul's references to freewill generosity or to any kind of support for Paul as being the result of "tithing", when scripture never says any such thing. In other words preachers who use this tactic are flat-out lying to their listeners.

The obvious question here is: If the tithe was still valid in Paul's time as pro-tithers say, then why did he have to beat around the bush like he did to solicit donations, when he could have quoted the old tithe law and collected 10% of everyone's incomes whether they liked it or not, and that would be that?

Likewise with the presumed storehouse connection that they claim links Paul's New Covenant instructions to Old Covenant tithe law. The connection is nonexistent except in the most reckless of imaginations.

That word “store” has a very wide, general application. I am sure people held items for use at a later date all the time back in the first century just as they do today. People today store aluminum cans for example, all the time, until they have them recycled. So is aluminum recycling a reference to the storehouse...
concept of Malachi 3:10 as well, just because they are saving or "storing" something? Do people "tithe" aluminum cans just because they once stored them? Of course not, but it makes about as much sense as this whole similar language hypothesis held by certain tithe promoters, but once again, it is typical for pro-tithers because fiction is all they have to work with. They have to do all kinds of fancy dancing with scriptures like this to make it look like their tithe doctrine fits with New Covenant statements that in reality indicate something entirely different.

It is a perfect example of why people get turned off to the Bible, Christianity, and God's true Law, and why they dismiss your valid scriptural comments by saying "Oh, you can make the Bible say anything you want." They will be proven right in their skepticism if this similar language nonsense is ever accepted or taken seriously.

Acts 11:29 and Romans 15:26 & 27 refer to that same collection situation that Paul was talking about in 1Corinthians 16:2, as does 2Corinthians 9:1-8, which clarifies Paul’s meaning. For the sake of efficiency he wanted things organized and ready to go when the carts came around for collection. That is all. It is not some secretly-worded instructions to tithe that only preachers can see and decipher.

Paul states in verses 5-7: "Therefore I thought it necessary to exhort the brethren to go to you ahead of time, and prepare your generous gift [not tithe] beforehand which you had previously promised, that it may be ready as a matter of generosity and not as a grudging obligation. But this I say: He who sows sparingly will also reap sparingly, and he who sows bountifully will also reap bountifully. So let each one give as he purposes in his heart, not grudgingly or of necessity; for God loves a cheerful giver."

Do you see a single word in that scripture that can be identified as having to do with tithe (which was an obligation and a necessity) or a tenth of anything, as the pro-tithers claim? Paul is asking for freewill donations in amounts to be determined by the sole discretion of the giver.

Once again, a straightforward reading of scripture explains itself by what it says. Forget the speculation of supposedly secret meanings; Paul would not have to encourage generosity if he were enforcing a tithe. The people were not "playing God" by deciding for themselves how much to give, as Paul asked them
to do, even if it was not the magical 10% figure that tithe promoters say it
must be.

Romans 15:27 defines an expectation and blessing of giving, whatever the
amount. It is more like a "we are our brother's keeper" idea. It was giving, but
giving in the right spirit. It is not "being forced to willingly give", which is a
pro-tithe oxymoron that describes tithing. Those people were looking for an
opportunity to give to others in need, because they knew of the blessings of
giving to God, and they knew the scriptural way of accomplishing that goal. It
had nothing to do with tithing at all.
Chapter 22

Rome: The Mother of Today’s Tithe

"Anyone who attempts to construe a personal view of God which conflicts with Church dogma must be burned without pity." - POPE INNOCENT III

Even if Paul were to get the kind of cash donations that modern preachers get, his writings indicate that he would have used it to help others, not to enrich himself. Acts 20:33-5 “The silver or gold or garments of no one did I covet; and ye yourselves know that to my necessities, and to those who were with me, minister did these hands. [physical work in self-support] I have shewed you all things, how that so laboring ye ought to support the weak, [no mention of paying hireling preachers] and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive.”

This was the pattern set for preachers, as instructed by Jesus, and exemplified by Paul, Peter, and the rest: A non-materialistic lifestyle; accepting basic gifts like a meal or clothing if they were offered. If none were, then they would support themselves through labor to obtain basic necessities; giving any left over money to the needy.

This pattern, this scriptural standard that was set for those who claim to be men of God or God’s workers, was then ignored or abolished somewhere down the line by the Roman Catholic Church, which hijacked the original Christian way of living and turned it into a religion business for profit and control.

Sure, there were Catholic monks and others living under very modest conditions and who were probably good and very devout men, though misled, that correctly followed Paul's example. However, the business model of the Church hierarchy was to rake in the cash using lies, and imposing scriptural ignorance on the people. Catholic peons of the middle ages slept in their houses/barns (often one and the same building) with the livestock, due to their poverty while the church leaders were decked with gold. The best job a man could get was to be in the religion business as a priest. The racket has changed very little since then.

"The game is simple: Rob people while maintaining an air of entitlement, and make them feel like the criminal for not being happy to fork over the money."
It was the Roman Catholic Church that resurrected and reformatted this whole tithe concept from the Old Covenant, and it has been *The Church’s New Clothes* ever since. The tithe and the selling of indulgences were the perfect excuses to extort and scam the people out of their money. The game is simple: Rob people in the name of God while maintaining an air of entitlement, and make them feel like the criminal if they are not happy, even privileged, to fork over the money.

People do not seem to realize just how much of the Protestant doctrines today (including the Kingdom Israel, and other small independent groups) still have their roots in Roman Catholicism rather than in Biblical fact. To this very day tithe promoters and their writings quote fifth and sixth century Roman Catholic Church documents as being examples of "early Christian" tithing, and as "authority" for legitimizing a mandated tithe today.

A tithe promoter in my former circle of acquaintances, using author R.J.Rushdooney as an authoritative reference for validating a modern tithe, quotes Rushdooney’s book *Tithing and Dominion* as a basis for his position. Mr Rushdooney in turn, is quoted as justifying his position by attributing his information to “references here and there, and surviving documents apparently spoke of the tithe as an obligation”. He goes on to name his source as being the “Constitutions of the Holy Apostles”.

So in other words, in order to impress his listeners, one tithe promoter running short of material, has to quote another, more well known tithe promoter, who in turn is making wishy-washy assertions using meaningless terms about ancient writings which are irrelevant because this “early church” referred to as the source of the “here and there” alleged references, is the Roman Catholic Church. This is the organization put into practice the self-serving false dogma of deriving its tithe-taking authority from the Bible.

The document having the authoritative sounding title of: “Constitutions of the Holy Apostles” is dated no earlier than 300 AD and probably closer to 400 AD. It has no connection whatsoever with the real Apostles of Jesus that we are familiar with.

Remember - This document (or others like it) is *foundational* in regard to “early Christian examples” of tithing.
You can view this information online if you wish to do a search, or the books of the past two hundred years that have translated and published these writings are readily available in a searchable digital format very inexpensively. Once you discover some of the other grossly un-Christian ideologies put forth in these writings, it will become apparent as to why the modern tithe promoters avoid naming this document or similar ones as being the source of their purported pro-tithe authority.

We in essence have a giant derivative bubble of pro-tithe propaganda. One pro-tither reverencing and applying a false sense of value to information that he derived from quoting second pro-tither; this second pro-tither is a man who simply pontificated his opinions of dubious value based on information that he derived from a spurious document; this document itself is derived from the self-serving personal interests of members representing a commercialized pro-tithe religious organization that had no truthful authority to begin with. This organization simply used Christianity as a cover story to brainwash, control, and exploit an ignorant populace, made possible by their tight control of scriptural information.

That organization, (which admittedly) is responsible for the murder and torture of millions of Christians, along with untold theft and destruction of advanced ancient knowledge around the world (ancient Greek mathematics, the libraries of Alexandria, Central America, etc) derives from itself its right to accept tithes via the arrogant assumption that they speak for God. Yet it cannot scripturally prove this right to take tithes any more than anyone else can, and most certainly has demonstrated that it does not speak for God.

If the dogmas and doctrines of this so-called Mother Church existed today in a group of say, ten thousand people it would be examined and ridiculed as an absurd and dangerous pagan cult, hate group, or terrorist organization. But since it had an early head start and has those millions of followers who apparently succumb to a hive mentality of some kind, and because it has many centuries of wealth accumulation to back itself up, it therefore has the materialistic clout to achieve a guise of legitimacy; no matter how unscriptural their practices are or how perverted their priests and other officials are.

Even with the unscriptural, arrogant mindset that went into creating the “Constitutions” document, it was only advisory in nature; an opinion based on the
wishful thinking of materialistic men. As are any other pro-tithe statements from that era until now.

It was not until the Council of Tours in the year 567 that the tithe was declared by the pope to be obligatory. So it took many decades, if not centuries of church politics and finagling to get from the time that the tithe concept was reintroduced, to the time that it was officially church law, which was over five hundred years into the New Covenant Era.

If tithing was actually taught by Paul and the other Apostles, common sense tells you that it would have been instituted from day one.

And yet, Protestant and particularly pro-nomian preachers who might normally condemn the practices of what some of them refer to as “The Whore of Babylon”, will suddenly become bedfellows with, and embracing the writings of this very Church for solace and support of their bogus tithe doctrine. Tithe promoters then refer to these documents vaguely as the “writings of the Early Church”. I have even heard them define this term as “from the Apostle Paul and on up”, which is a total lie, and indicates the unreliability of these people whether through ignorance or intentional deceit.

We must appreciate the absurdity of it all, but let us remember that tithe promoters have very little choice; it is all they have to work with - *it’s the best they’ve got*. Keep that in mind, people. These pro-tithe arguments that I am examining are not their weakest points that I have selected to try to make myself look smart by easily debunking them. These *really are the best arguments the tithe industry can come up with*.

**Birds of a Feather are Known by their Fruits**

What is this document that pro-tithers attach themselves to, and use as their authority? What other dogmas, philosophies and tenets, besides tithing, does the “Constitutions of the Holy Apostles” contain?

It contains such doctrines as honoring and reverencing the clergy more than you do your own parents, with a penalty of death for failure to do so, because they are your intercessor to God.

This includes your total obedience to them because, to quote:
“For now the [local] deacon is to you [as if he were] Aaron, and the [Catholic] bishop [as if he were] Moses. If, therefore, Moses was called a God by the Lord, let the [Catholic] bishop be honored among you as a God, and the [local] deacon as his prophet.”

Contrary to New Covenant scripture, they promote the doctrine that does not allow the average Christian to communicate with God without the services of a priest.

“As, therefore, it was not lawful for one of another tribe, that was not a Levite, to offer anything, or to approach the altar without the priest, so also do you do nothing without the bishop; for if any one does anything without the bishop, he does it to no purpose. For it will not be esteemed as of any avail to him.”

“…so every lay person shall not be unpunished who despises God, and is so mad as to affront His priests, and unjustly to snatch that honor [of approaching the throne of God through prayer] to himself:”

“…how dare any man thrust himself into the priesthood who has not received that dignity from his superior, and do such things which it is lawful only for the priests to do?”

“You [Catholic priests, etc] are to the laity prophets, rulers, governors, and kings; the mediators between God and His faithful people, who receive and declare His word, well acquainted with the Scriptures.”

“As to a good shepherd [priests, etc], let the lay person honor him, love him, reverence him as his Lord, as his master, as the high priest of God, as a teacher of piety. For he that heareth him, heareth Christ; and he that rejecteth him, rejecteth Christ;”
These quotes give an idea of the mindset of the people who wrote that document, and you can also see where today's pro-tithe preachers get some of their delusions about being rulers, Levites, and God's anointed, etc.

The above-indicated mindset is where all of the Christian denominations who elevate their clergy to a higher status, get their ideas from. This goes in spades for the pro-nomian types who claim a rulership status or have the audacity to make bizarre claims such as that they want to present their congregation as a “chaste bride” to Jesus Christ (citing the Apostle Paul's statement in 2Corinthians 11:2), or other condescending "Me pastor, you sheep" statements.

Romans 12:3 "For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith."

I suggest that you locate and read “The Constitutions of the Holy Apostles” if you want to get a feel for how the elitist preachers think.

Prior to the organized hijacking of Christianity, Christian gatherings for brotherhood, communion, and worship were smaller, more personal, and consisted more of group discussions and participation rather than the stage show arrangement commonly held in commercial churches today.

This document is one of the earliest of its kind, and later Roman Catholic doctrines and writings build on it. This and similar documents are what the pro-tithers are quoting when they say "writings of the Early Christians".

Having said all that, I would like to point out that like many things, this "Constitutions of the Holy Apostles" is not all bad. The irony is that even though it promotes a tithe, it is very conservative on how the lower level clergy are to partake of it:

“Let the bishop esteem such food and raiment sufficient as suits necessity and decency. Let him not make use of the Lord’s goods as another’s, but moderately;”

Even they understood the basic necessities (food and raiment) instruction of Jesus, though you do not hear this part quoted by pro-tithers.

While this writing endorsed a moderate-to-lowly lifestyle which allows only enough for basic necessities similar to what scripture directs, the real idea apparently was to funnel the bulk of the tithe money and indulgences to the
upper levels of the church hierarchy, while presenting a façade of humble piousness to the people on the local level.

As with nearly every man-made religion today, they create a hybrid religion that includes enough truth to give the creation plausible validity, while the structure of the organization makes sure that the main benefit in the way of money, control, and power is funneled to the individuals at the top of the new entity.

So, true to form - even as the pro tithers pick and choose which scriptures they wish to present and which to ignore, so also do they practice their art of selective recognition and omission in their use of quotes from documents of corrupt origin that they rely upon to support their tithe doctrine.

What does a self-authorizing, totally homo-centric document like the “Constitutions” have to do with real, scriptural, truth-seeking Christianity? Not a thing. Nothing except to show that the pro-tithe camp is so desperate for support material that they will look absolutely anywhere for it, take what they can find, and then try to sell it as a legitimate source of Early Christian information.

It seems to me that if any legitimate documentation whatsoever existed from the first century, written by those who actually learned from Jesus or the Apostles first hand; and if those documents even remotely supported a New Covenant tithe, we would have heard of them many, many, many times over. We would not be hearing all these irrelevant quotes originating from a corrupt church circa 3-500 years after the last apostle died.
Chapter 23

"Robbing Temples"

Another common stratagem is for pro tithers to quote Romans 2:22 "thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou rob temples?" and then interpret this verse to mean "you who condemn the idol worship of the pagans, do you rob your own God by not paying your tithe?"

Once again, not only is the pro tithe spin on this scripture absolutely without merit or basis, but it is easily proven to be so. No one, and I mean no one who did even the most elementary honest research could pervert this verse in such a manner.

First, the obvious: "Temples" means more than one, which indicates pagan religion because they had numerous gods and temples. Yahweh God of Israel, the God and father referred to by Jesus and the Apostles had one temple; the big one in Jerusalem. The local meeting places were called synagogues.

Romans 2:22 does not say "dost thou rob the temple?" it says "temples". Again, a child could see that fact.

Secondly the Greek word there for "rob temples" is Strong's #2216 which is a verb meaning to rob or vandalize a temple or sacred site. It is used only this one time in the Bible.

However Strong's #2217 is a noun meaning a person who commits the act of #2216; in other words someone who robs or vandalizes temples. This word is also used only once in the Bible, and that is in Acts 19:37 "For ye have brought hither these men, who are neither robbers of temples nor blasphemers of our goddess.

If therefore Demetrius, and the craftsmen that are with him, have a matter against any man, the courts are open, and there are proconsuls: let them accuse one another."

The context is that there was a pagan mob that wanted to lynch Paul's associates, when a man called the crowd to their senses and pointed out that these men were not criminals or being offensive to their goddess, as was apparently the accusation being thrown around.

So here is the question: If "robbing temples" means to not pay a tithe to the Yahweh, God of Israel as the pro tithers claim it does, why would this angry
pagan mob care one way or the other if someone of another religion tithes to a
God that these people do not know or care about?

We have in this story, a roused up rabble that wants to kill or severely
trounce these two men. In this tense situation the tithe promoters are trying to
tell us that someone simply gets up and says "Hey guys, no need to get angry.
I know you think that these two fellas that you are about to kill don't tithe,
but they really do tithe to their God like they are supposed to. If you disagree,
then you can go to your fellow pagan authorities and press criminal charges
against them".

Then we are further expected to believe that the mob says something like
"Oh, they do tithe? We thought they said that they didn't tithe. Someone said
that they robbed temples, so of course we assumed that they were not paying
tithe to that God over there in Jerusalem... what was His name again? Oh well,
that's a relief; sorry old chaps, big misunderstanding. As long as you're tithing
to your God that we don't even know, you're all aces with us."

This absurd scenario is only made possible by the pro-tithers who say that
"robbing temples" means failing to pay a Levitical tithe, which again, these
pagans could not care less about, and certainly would not be a cause to start a
riot over.

So, pro-tithe fiction aside, it is easy to see what really happened in this
story, because scripture clearly tells us what took place: Someone riled up a
mob with lies, telling them that Paul and his people vandalized the pagan temples
and stole the offerings that had been left at them. The enraged group calmed
down once they realized they did not have a case to go to court with because
the accusations may not have been true.

It is a very simple, straightforward account. Unless of course, you accept the
pro tithe false interpretation of the original words "robbers of temples" as
meaning "non-tither"; which then turns valuable scripture into nonsense.

Likewise with the Romans 2:22 verse that we started out with: "Robbing
temples" means robbing temples. It means what it plainly says; it is addressing
the issue of double-mindedness, and it would not be a matter for a tithe
discussion if the tithe promoters kept their absurd greed-inspired
interpretations of scripture under control.
Paul is simply pointing out the hypocrisy of the Law "experts"; whether teachers or students. They publicly proclaimed anything associated with paganism as being unclean and untouchable. However, the offerings at these pagan temples were not *too* unclean or *too* untouchable when it came to profiting by stealing them.

This concept is very much alive today in preachers who condemn Catholicism for example, as being Babylonian paganism and every other bad thing they can say about it; many of these same preachers also have nothing good to say about modern Judaism. Whether their indictments of these two groups are true or false is not the issue. The point is that, while the pro tithers are doing so, they will at the same time also embrace the Christ-denying (see Chapter 7) Orthodox Jewish tradition of tithing, as well as the unscriptural doctrines of purely Catholic origin like today’s tithe on all income. All for one basic reason: because it is *profitable*.

A buck is a buck, and business is business, I guess.
Chapter 24
Preachers Tithe, So You Should Too

Here is a tactic that nearly every tither has heard. Preachers will tell you that Jesus advocated tithing because he said in Luke 11:42 “But woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye tithe mint and rue and all manner of herbs, and pass over judgment and the love of God: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.”

In combination with that verse, they may add Matthew 5:20 which says "Unless your righteousness exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees, you will in nowise enter the Kingdom of the heavens".

This will often be followed up with something like: “See? The Pharisees were righteous because they followed the law and tithed.”

This appears to be just the opposite of what Jesus meant to point out.

In reality, Luke 11:42 depicts Jesus as intending to deliver more of a backhanded acknowledgement of their law-keeping as part of a scathing rebuke of their hypocrisy.

While the hard working farmers were tithing hundreds of pounds of grain and numerous head of livestock, the Pharisees were tithing literally spoonfuls of herbs from their little kitchen window boxes just so they could make a show of the idea that they followed God’s Law and tithed like everyone else.

In exactly the same manner modern preachers tell us that everyone should tithe because, as they will state with pride, they (preachers) follow the law and tithe just like everyone else.

Can they really be serious? The concept of tithing preachers is not only hyped-up public relations propaganda, it is also practically impossible from a scriptural Law-keeping point of view.

Has it occurred to anyone that preachers tithe to each other? So it is like: “I’ll tithe five thousand to you if you tithe five thousand to me. That way we can both be righteous law-keepers, and break even as well.”

"The claim of preachers inter-tithing to each other is in reality, a man-made sham custom that is just one facet of the bigger man-made sham doctrine."
As one of many man-made religious rituals, this alleged act of preachers tithing to each other is unknown in scripture. Preachers base their supposed tithing-taking right on the idea that they are a modern counterpart to the Levites, and that the modern tithe is based on the Law of Moses.

So then, when did Levites ever tithe to each other as modern preachers claim to do? We know that the Levites were expected to give a tithe of the tithe up to the higher class of Aaronite priests, but they never tithed to each other.

In order for this to work today, there would have to be a low class of preachers that tithe to the higher class of priest-preachers. These priest-preachers could not receive tithe from the congregation, but only from the low class (Levite-like) preachers in order for this system to in any way even remotely fit with what God’s Law says about the Levitical tithe.

The claim of preachers inter-tithing to their friends as if it were a Christmas gift exchange at the office, is in reality a man-made sham custom that is just one facet of the bigger man-made sham doctrine. It is all part of the big show. It is window dressing that helps to give this counterfeit modern tithe a bit more of the air of the real Levitical tithe, but it does not take much to see that it is entirely un-Levitical when it is examined.

Even if preachers do tithe to their preacher buddies - big deal. Giving up ten percent to a system that provides free, undeserved money in the first place is no indication of integrity or righteousness. Preachers are pious about their position and about allegedly following a law, but that is because they are being paid to do it. Exchanging $1 bills for $10 bills as a cost of doing business - a 900% profit margin - is more of an indictment of the honesty of the system, rather than an indication of its scriptural accuracy.

Keep in mind that this is all within the context that their books are kept secret. We have no way to know that they ever actually tithe anything to anyone; we just know that they say they do.

Additionally, when you hear the pro-tithers bring up Luke 11:42 that we just read, how often do you hear them include Luke 11:41? “But rather give alms of such things as ye have; and, behold, all things are clean unto you.”
Almsgiving (helping the needy) cleanses you inside and out, according to the context of that scripture. This matches James 1:27 “Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.”

You will notice that as usual, Jesus did not say anything like “Tithe, and behold, all things are clean unto you” or “Give money to the preachers or the corporate church and all things will be clean unto you”. Neither did James allude to any of these modern man-created tithing activities as keeping anyone “unspotted from the world”.

The “give your money to the church/preacher” doctrine appears to be entirely man-made, since valid scriptures that support the modern tithe doctrine do not seem to exist at all.

One Step Beyond...

But that’s not all, folks. The icing on the “preachers tithe too” cake is both disgusting and laughable at the same time.

In one particular CD series of tithe sermons, the speaker not only takes it upon himself to define for you the type of preacher that is entitled to receive your tithe (practically narrowing it down to himself and a few of his orbiting cohort-elders, who are basically his doctrinal clones), but he also presumes to school us on what type of income is tithable, and what is not; basically emulating the exemptions of the IRS code. All of it being foreign to legitimate scriptural tithe Law.

Of course any money that you work to obtain is tithable according to him, as is investment income, rentals, etc. Almost every source of money which anyone might receive is tithable, save for one notable and unexplained exception: gifts.

At first this special exemption for gifts did not make sense to me since a gift certainly counts as an increase according to the pro-tithe philosophy, but then it quickly dawned on me that almost any money given to this preacher could be considered a gift, which this preacher has determined by fiat to be non-tithable for himself. After all, the common jingle is “supported by your tithes and offerings”, so who gets to determine which of these two it is, since most of it is not specifically designated by the giver?
So in short:

• he promotes a bogus tithe;
• then he defines himself, as so many do, as being one of the very few preachers or churches worthy of giving your tithe to;
• he may then exempt the bulk of the money that he gets from being subject to the modern tithe by counting it as a “gift”,
• after that, he also brags that he “tithes like everyone else”.

I think it is called “having your cake and eating it too” - and why not? If they are inventing a self-serving tithe doctrine, then why not invent self-serving exemptions for themselves as well?

Congress does it all the time with preferential privileges for themselves and their sponsors; in fact the mechanisms and technique of government corruption have a mirror image in the playbook of organized religion. What works for corrupt government will work for corrupt religious organizations as well as any corporate hierarchy. The management techniques and exploitation of people/livestock is practically as established as horticulture and dog training, thwarted only by an awareness of the targeted individuals, and their determination to resist such manipulation.

Needless to say, this man's example of make-it-up-as-we-go-along is certainly not unique among preachers.

The point of mentioning this is to show how blatantly conceited and corrupt these pro-tithe preachers can get with their fraud and sense of solipsism when their preaching goes unchallenged by the congregation.

We would not buy a used car from someone who exhibited this kind of lack of moral conscience or blatant opportunism, but we will trust him with scriptural instruction of us and our children. Is that it?
Section 6:
Other Reasons Not to Tithe to Your Preacher

We have talked about Old and New Covenant scriptures that pro-tithers use to perpetuate the myth of the tithe, and how invalid these arguments readily reveal themselves to be under basic, elementary scrutiny. Now let us talk about more reasons; logical, empirical, common sense reasons, to repent of this folly of tithing, in favor what plainly worded scripture instructs us to do.
Chapter 25
Tithing is not “Giving to God”

There is no denying that human beings (Christians included) have committed some pretty disgraceful and wicked deeds. The other side of the coin is that many people, whether Christian or not, have a desire and ability to do good that they have demonstrated in many, many recorded examples, not to mention the countless untold acts that occur on a daily basis. This desire has the potential to be an incredibly powerful force for virtuous progress in the world.

“If so,” you may ask, “then why isn’t this world a better place than it was 30, or 10, or even 5 years ago? Why the constant downhill slide?”

The answer to that, is not that there is more evil in the world than good, nor is it because good people are not willing to take any action to improve things.

Instead, the answer is that this willingness to do good has been skillfully captured and turned back on itself like a judo move. This particular art of deception specializes in harnessing and diverting the good will and virtuous intentions of the unwary population, and directing that energy toward useless or self-harming purposes which are simultaneously beneficial to those who do the misdirecting: that is, the rulers.

Luke 16:8 "... for the sons of this age are more shrewd in relation to their own kind than the sons of light."

Since government, like the ruling class that owns it, is parasitic in nature and to a large degree unable to exist without a productive host, this art form of intention-jacking has been practiced at nearly every level of authoritarian or so-called leadership positions throughout recorded history. The task of these rulers is one of convincing the rulees that achieving certain goals is for the benefit of the common people who are paying the price to achieve that goal, when in reality any benefit achieved or majority of it, goes to the rulers.
More effectively: the job is to convince others that achieving the goal of the leaders is the *good* or the *morally right* thing to do.

Of course the *ideal situation* is to dupe the people into thinking that what they are doing or supporting is *both* in their own best interest, and is also the virtuously correct thing to do. When this is accomplished, the leaders have a steamroller going; they have acquired the manpower and the moral sanctuary to commit any atrocities necessary to achieve their purpose. Those who point out the hypocrisy, immorality, or outright insanity of a destructive course of action are deemed to be the troublemakers and enemies of mankind; today they are also often called “terrorists”.

The Inquisition which was waged by Catholic Church leaders, The War between the States, World War I, World War II, today’s income tax, the Cold War and its successor the “War on Terror”, the "War on Cancer" and the monstrously destructive infant vaccination campaigns are all good examples of misled good people carrying out the will of the wicked for the benefit of the wicked.

This is the very essence and purpose of what we call *war propaganda*, *public policy*, *national security*, *loyalty to the Crown*, etc., as well as being central to perverted versions of *obeying God’s Law*, or what establishment religion considers to be *Christian morality* or *righteousness* in general.

After all, how many church-going *good* people having Sunday dinner ever give a thought to the death and destruction they helped cause by their ignorant support of the current State of Israel? Or the destruction of Iraq? Or the disastrous consequences to the innocent, in those so-called *wars on terror* or *war on drugs*? How has that 40 year old “war on cancer” been working out for us? How many hundreds of millions of dollars was given to the Haitian earthquake victim relief funds, that never quite got to helping any of the victims?

How many other wars and military actions have *good* people supported or participated in that have killed some of the best young men in the gene pool (who are often victims of an imposed military draft)? How many have also supported war-like campaigns that have slaughtered, poisoned, and horribly maimed untold thousands of innocent children and other non-combatants?
How many charity events have been held for the purpose of “finding the cure”, with money coming from participants willing to do something good, only to have that money go to organizations that actually suppress and outlaw the cures that have already been discovered?

Or how many Christians promote or shoot up their own children with vaccines that kill or maim many more children every year than does the disease itself that they are allegedly protecting against?

Whether it was revering the kings and Catholic hierarchy of centuries past; or obeying destructive laws made by political cronies who are owned by corporations today; or even if it consists of submitting to Protestant, Jewish, and pagan religious rulers; in all of these cases you will see an obvious pattern. Anywhere that people surrender their personal authority and responsibility to others, you will see that the outcomes are exactly the same.

In a nutshell: The many pay, and the many work, and the many suffer, for the benefit of a few. The very many who are deceived, pay for the very few who are in the loop; with the end result almost always being bad for the common people, regardless of their good intentions and whether or not they are on the “winning” side of the conflict.

The result is that those who actually carry out this policy, the boots on the ground who are following orders and who are personally causing the suffering (the military and police, lower levels of news media, government workers, teachers, medical doctors and nurses, etc) actually believe that what they are doing is for a noble cause and actually benefitting society as a whole, when in fact the very evil that they think they are fighting would often not exist without their active but misguided participation.

John 16:2 "... yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service."

Jer 5:4 “Therefore I said, Surely these are poor; they are foolish: for they know not the way of the LORD, nor the judgment of their God.”

While well-intentioned people are often deceived to carry out the plans of the wicked, examples of evil people inadvertently accomplishing something good are almost nonexistent; thus we see society’s "down-hill slide".

This type of mind-manipulation in the guise of mislabeled patriotism, corporate advertising and brand loyalty, so-called "news" reports, and of course in ever-
present false religion surrounds us every day. It results in the theft and conversion of good intentions that are then used to support ungodly policies.

So then, what does all this have to do with giving to God?

Many Christians have a desire to do good. They have heard about “giving to God” and “honoring God with their wealth” as scripture instructs, but they have been deceived about how they should engage in these activities. It appears that the age-old tactics of control and diversion used by the worldly establishment to achieve their aims have been adopted not only by the pro-tithe religious operators, but also the money begging “the ministry needs your help” factions of today’s commercial Christian establishment. They make their best interests appear to be your best interests, and top it off with a thick layer of "thus sayeth the Lord", "Onward Christian Soldier", and other false applications of scriptural sentiment.

The gist of what you might hear is “Honor God by giving the church your money”. “It’s your moral obligation”, "God loves a cheerful giver", and “God will return to you many times more than what you give Him. Oh, and by the way, God will curse you if you don’t.”

These are all buzzwords and emotional hot buttons that are used to exploit and misdirect the Christian's willingness to do that which is right, and convert it to a useless or even harmful act of funding hireling false preachers.

**Giving to God**

Let us examine scripture and think about this for a minute: God does not want tithe money, or any money per se for that matter. That would be like tithing sand to the Arabs. Obviously, money never literally goes to God by placing it on an altar and watching it fade away into the spiritual dimension; or by letting it float up into the sky and into outer space until it gets to Heaven. "Giving to God" is a figure of speech that means that it is a special, personal little deal and that the money, or goods stay right here on Earth, but go to the place designated by the Word of God. Once we have done this, He enjoys the spiritual savor of the giver's obedience and heartfelt willingness to give.
The gift is only a *vehicle*; a means of delivering the spirits of obedience, benevolence, and empathy among others, that emanate from the giver in the act of giving. It is a means of spiritual *connection* of the brethren between each other and with The Creator. The Earthly receiver benefits from all this of course, while God takes His *cut*, if you want to put it in those terms, of the savor of that willful, giving spirit.

A grudging, deceptive, selfish or otherwise negative spirit ruins the whole process.

An example of willful, *obedient* giving, is one that we looked at some chapters back in Deuteronomy 16:10-17 “And thou shalt keep the feast of weeks unto the LORD thy God with a tribute of a *freewill offering* of thine hand, which thou shalt give unto the LORD thy God, according as the LORD thy God hath blessed thee:

And thou shalt rejoice before the LORD thy God, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maidservant, and the Levite that is within thy gates, and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, that are among you, in the place which the LORD thy God hath chosen to place his name there.

And thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondman in Egypt: and thou shalt observe and do these statutes.”

It says to “give unto the LORD”, *along with instructions* on how to accomplish that act. *In this particular case* it was done by contributing what you could toward the enjoyment of everyone. This is just one example of the type of instructions pertaining to various situations throughout the Bible on how to "give to God", and it only makes sense.

Even though God had elsewhere ordained that tithed food was to go to the Levites, in this case some of the food became available to Levites, but was not a tithe. It went for a different purpose than that which the tithe was intended. It was a different situation that had its own instructions to go with it. Tithing called for one set of instructed actions, and this event called for a vaguely similar but notably different set of actions; either of which, though different, was considered to be "obedience to the LORD". While tithing was a mandated act, the willful giving involved in peace offerings like this added another dimension of willfulness and spirituality to the event.

If instead of following these instructions, a Levite was to tell someone to put their offerings of wine and cheese meant for this feast into the Levite's private
root cellar for his personal use at a later date, it would not truly be going to
God in any way, shape, or form, regardless of what kind of cover story the
Levite came up with, or how pure the giver's motives were. In fact it would be
outright theft from God because it circumvented His clearly stated instructions
and intention, in favor of the personal benefit of the thief (the Levite).

This is exactly what happens when you give tithe (or any) money to a church
corporation, or preacher for a reason or in a manner that is not specifically
scripturally instructed, but is instead based solely on what that preacher told
you.

Here are two points to remember:

- There is no scriptural instruction for any Christian to tithe anything to
  anyone - ever.
- Nor is there any particular virtue, scriptural legitimacy, or Godly
  approval to giving money to professional preachers or church corporations
  for their own prosperity.

There are however loads of man-made rationalizations, justifications,
excuses, doctrines, and sophistic techniques that insist on such activities;
probably more than you could ever hope to read. I hope you realize however,
that these efforts mean nothing, nothing: not a single thing if they are not
supported by God's Word.

As we have seen, the tithe doctrine conflicts with scripture on almost every
front.

Acts 17:25 tells us that God does not need us to provide for Him. On the
contrary - He provides everything for us. Our job is to take what He provides
for us and use it in an unselfish manner that glorifies and honors Him, along with
providing for our own. There is clearly a way for us to do this, and many ways
not to do it.

**How Not to Give to God**

I mean, you do not honor someone by paying tribute to their antithesis; for
example you do not honor your wife by giving a dozen roses to some floozy down
at the local bar & grill. It does not quite work.
"Sorry honey, the flowers were meant for you, but that other woman was better looking."

Likewise you do not honor God by giving money to a hireling false preacher who does not have the right to take it; particularly when scriptural instructions for "giving to God" are plainly specified and emphatically stated in the Bible.

"Sorry God, the money was meant for you, but the preacher's tithe sermon was so much more convincing. He's such a marvelous speaker, you know."

They say "the road to hell is paved with good intentions". That means getting a well intentioned person to do evil, while tricking them into believing that it is good. It can also mean diverting those good intentions to an activity that simulates a worthy cause, but which in fact is accomplishing nothing of true, God-instructed value. Both of these describe the basis of a modern tithe.

In this case the deception relates to tithe proponents co-opting scriptural terms like "giving to God", and "Honoring God with your wealth", and then falsely and repeatedly applying those terms to the act of giving money to a preacher or church. These entities in turn pave the road to hell even further; adding a few more lanes to it with even more bogus teachings and doctrines, funded by money that was scripturally instructed to go elsewhere.

If the false preachers went unfunded, they and their false doctrines would eventually dry up and blow away like tumbleweeds. As we can see however, there are more corporate churches, and less righteousness in the world than any of us have ever seen, so the unrighteous success of today's money changer church businesses speaks for itself.

A Mini-False Religion, within a False Doctrine

It is amazing to see these tithe-taking preachers who demand a "full tithe" and invoke the illusion that "they and the tithers will be blessed by obeying God's Law", yet only mention 10% as being that full tithe instead of 12%.

Along with that conjuration comes the belief of the people themselves, who feel that they have been blessed by God because they have paid their "full" 10% tithe. How can they be blessed if they are robbing God by paying only 10% in cash instead of the 12% instructed in God's Law? Would they feel blessed if they gave only 2%? Or 5%? Or maybe 8.39%? Why do they feel blessed after
having paid 10% when that figure constitutes disobedience just as much as any other figure short of 12%?

Is it perhaps some kind of placebo effect? Is it the preacher-inculcated belief in the figure of a 10% cash tithe that is creating the tither’s conviction that they are blessed? In other words, it is their belief that they are obeying God’s Law that in turn creates the belief that they are blessed that is blessing them, and really has nothing at all to do with the money they have just thrown away. “Blessing” is a highly subjective state of mind, do not forget. Jesus said many times that belief and faith were the key factors to miracles, so they can certainly also give a person a more upbeat outlook on life that they then interpret as “blessedness”. By the way, Jesus never once collected a tithe as a pre-requisite for any of His blessings or miracles.

Scripture provides no reason whatsoever that this activity known as Christian era tithing should cause the tither to be blessed and not cursed, particularly when this activity funds deceptive imposters while it diverts and distracts people away from actively engaging in true Christian giving. Selfless giving to those in need is an act for which the New Covenant blessings are clearly described for us not only by Jesus, but also by Paul, James, John and Peter.

The doctrine of being saved by “asking Jesus into your heart” diverts would-be Christians from the clear scriptural instructions of Baptism. Likewise the doctrine of being blessed by God for tithing is just as fictional and destructive, when it diverts people away from God’s true instructions on giving.

There are those that say that freedom in modern America consists of the freedom to think you are free (everything else requires a permit). This thought can also be applied to the “blessing of tithing”, which would consist of paying for the privilege of allowing yourself to believe that you are blessed.

In theory the blessing for tithing would come from following God’s Law. We have shown that in no way does tithing today constitute a following of that Law. Modern tithing ignores the one-two punch of God’s Law on tithing. Namely that the tithe consists exclusively of a portion of the agricultural increase of the ground, and that it should be given only to Levites.
Modern tithing consists of cash payments of ten percent when the Law says that in such cases the amount should be twelve percent, and only in lieu of the food products that the cash tithe is a substitute for. Again, this is to be given only to the tribe of Levi; given to the tribe of Levi, as per the specific contract with that particular bloodline. It was never designated to go to anyone who claims to have the same job classification of a Levite (teacher, preacher, administrator, or the popular catch-all title: “God’s worker”)

Don’t forget - “God’s work” ends where financial profit begins. That is, any time someone accepts money in an amount that is more than the cost of their food and expense, they cease to be “God’s worker” and begin to be in the business of working for themselves.

So exactly when and where does this blessing-generating “following of the Law” event take place, outside of the crafted delusion - the belief that tithers are following the Law when they in fact are not?

I submit to you that the belief of tithers who think they are blessed because of their tithing, exists only because of the hypnotic suggestion; the falsely-implanted faith that causes them to see it. You currently may or may not consider yourself to be blessed in this life, but if you really are blessed, it would have nothing to do with tithing any more than it would have to do with other superstitious activities. This "blessing" or good luck could also be accomplished by a rabbit’s foot on a keychain if the same amount of religious propaganda was applied to create enough belief in it.

Faith in a rabbit’s foot, a lucky charm, a talisman, tarot cards, horoscopes, voodoo curses or in an unscriptural tithe doctrine could all just as easily be considered to be idolatry, but that does not make the faith and its perceived effects any less real.

It all boils down to the raw fact that the idea of being blessed for tithing to a preacher is by itself a mini-false religion. It actually makes things worse than if your money was stolen or destroyed rather than tithed.

The Wrong Thing for All the Wrong Reasons
Tithing, if it was not a self-oriented act originally, has been made to be one by modern church doctrine. People have been conditioned to tithe for three reasons:

- To gain much more than they tithed, as per commercial promotions based on Malachi’s “open the windows of heaven” statement.
- To avoid God’s curse which is allegedly incurred by not tithing; as per the preachers’ threats.
- To submit to the congregational peer pressure of gaining the preacher’s approval and figurative pat on the head for being a “good Christian” and a member in good standing of that church.

I know that some people will add to the list the concept that they tithe simply because they want to obey God and to please Him. This may be the right reason, but it is still doing the wrong thing. This mindset unfortunately has no real grounding in the truth. If people really tithed to please God and somehow submit to Him, why would they not choose to do so as both Old and New Covenants instruct us to?

It is simply because they trusted the information of a preacher who diverted the good intentions of these people, and put them on the dead-end road of commercial tithing.

If you have been tithing with the pure intention of (what you thought was) doing what is right, based on God’s will, then the next chapter will be of great interest to you.
Chapter 26

True Giving to God

"Honor the LORD from your wealth and from the first of all your produce;" - Prov. 3:9

So, if “giving to God” and "Honoring God with your wealth" (Proverbs 3:9) is good, as stated in scripture, what then is the proper, scripturally defined way of accomplishing that act?

Let us sweep away all the hype and endless opinion on the subject; the answer to that question is simple and in plain sight. Giving to God consists for all practical purposes, almost exclusively of the act of giving to those in need, as the following scriptures indicate:

Proverbs 19:17 “He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the LORD; and that which he hath given will He [God] pay him again.”

Proverbs 28:27 “He that giveth unto the poor shall not lack: but he that hideth his eyes shall have many a curse.”

Proverbs 29:7 “The righteous considereth the cause of the poor: but the wicked regardeth not to know it.”

Proverbs 31:8 “Open your mouth for the dumb [those so downtrodden that they are unable to assert themselves], for the rights of all who are left desolate and defenseless.”

Proverbs 31:20 states of the virtuous woman: “She extends her hand to the poor, and she stretches out her hands to the needy.”

2 Cor 9:12–13 Paul indicates that giving to the needy is part of your obedience (“professed subjection”) to the Gospel of Christ: “For the administration of this service [Donating to the fund intended to help others. “Service”, that word #3009 indicates a “service to God”] not only supplieth the want [That word “want” actually means “need”] of the saints, but is abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God; whiles by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ, and for your liberal distribution unto them, and unto all men.”
Did you catch that last sentence? Helping the needy is a demonstration of your subjection to the Gospel of Christ. The Gospel is not just a story to believe by faith, but it should form your way of thinking, through a number of actionable instructions and commandments to live by. The Book of James hammers this thought down conclusively.

John confirms this thought even more emphatically. Even in the clouded wording of the KJV the message is clear.

First John 3:17-18 "But whoso hath this world’s good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth."

"In truth" means according to scriptural teaching.

First John 4:6-11 "We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error."

He is basically saying "We (the Apostles) know what we are talking about. It is God's Word, take it or leave it as you are able. We know it is not meant for everyone, but it does show us who is of the truth and who is not by how you react to this message."

John's instructions continue: "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love. In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another."

This "love" spoken of in the above two quotes is not the shallow "Love you, man. Good luck in finding some food." kind of lip service to love. It is instead an empathy with your brother to the extent of that which you feel the pain as if it was your own self or your family members.

At the moment the part to focus on is that last sentence. It strips away any excuse for inaction on the part of all the pious "amen-ers" and "praise God-ers" who equate churchgoing and tithe-paying with loving God. It clearly presents God's instructions on the application of your love for Him to His chosen proxy: your Christian brothers and sisters. Particularly those in dire need. After all, it could just as well be you who is pushing that shopping cart down the street collecting aluminum cans.
Again, any favorable mention of tithing or over-funding a preacher is not found within these scriptures.

Luke 5:4-9 and John 21:5-11 are examples of how quickly fortunes can change. God could make us all rich if that was his plan, and in many ways He already has, but then what? By always having the least fortunate (by comparison to the rest of society) in our community, and by having our own times of plenty and times of need; we have opportunities readily available submit to the instructions of Christ and achieve the blessings of helping an unfortunate neighbor.

Proverbs 28:8 speaks of the rewards of helping the needy as does Psalm 112:9.


Psalm 41:1 “Blessed is he that considereth the poor: the LORD will deliver him [the giver] in time of trouble.”

Luke 11:41 “But rather give alms of such things as ye have; and, behold, all things are clean unto you.”

Luke 11:42, follows up on that statement and equates giving alms with justice and the love of God, as does 1John 3:17.

Luke 14:13-14 “But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: And thou shalt be blessed; for they cannot recompense thee: for thou shalt be compensated at the resurrection of the just.”

Luke 12:33 “Sell that ye have, and give alms [Alms is Strongs #1654, acts of compassion or benefit to the poor]; provide yourselves bags which wax not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not, where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth.”

First Timothy 6:17-19 “Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; That they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute [to the needy], willing to communicate [share some of their wealth]; Laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life.”

"This nexus between selfless generosity and eternal life can be found throughout the New Covenant"
This nexus between selfless generosity to the poor, and eternal life, can be found throughout the New Covenant. It all ties in with the Old Covenant as well.

If all of those scriptures are not definitive enough for you, try Proverbs 14:31 which states: “He who oppresses the poor taunts his Maker, but he who is gracious to the needy honors Him.” In other words - you “honor God with your wealth” by being gracious (helping) the needy brethren.

Are you still unclear about it? Here’s Jesus speaking in Matt 25:40 “And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it [helped, clothed, or fed] unto one of the least of these my brethren [the poor and humble], ye have done it unto me.”

Jesus is not talking (nor does he ever) about giving to hireling preachers or church enterprises as being a means of "giving to Him". Instead, He clearly identified himself with the least fortunate of the Israel people – the materially poor. In other words, if you choose to feed or help a poor man or his family, it is as if you are feeding or helping a hungry Jesus (God) himself.

Now, some may argue whether or not Jesus was God incarnate, or the Son of God, or a “prophet of God”, or whatever, but this is all a side issue and distraction in regard to the tithe subject. The point is that in any event, at the very least Jesus represented the will of God in His words and deeds. Thus He was close enough to God to clearly make the point of that scripture:

Helping the poor = helping/honoring Jesus = honoring God.

John 12:4-50 “He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my sayings, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I spake, the same shall judge him in the last day. For I spake not from myself; but the Father that sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak.

And I know that his commandment is life eternal: the things therefore which I speak, even as the Father hath said unto me, so I speak.”

A common reply to all this may be “Yes, of course we should give to the needy, but that’s secondary. ‘Honor God with your wealth’ or ‘giving to God’ means first and foremost “giving to the church or preacher” doesn’t it?”
Well, of course we all know where you heard that from, right? I hope that by now you realize that we cannot depend on certain self-interested parties like the church or the preacher for reliable information on this subject.

You can actually answer that question yourself - After reading that last batch of scriptures on giving to the poor, try a search of your Bible and prove me wrong: How many scriptures can you find in the entire Bible that instruct, or provide examples for you to give money, especially 10% of your income, to today's preachers?

How many scriptures are there that say that your offerings to God belong to the church corporation to pay off the mortgage, or for the new Mustang for the preacher's daughter? My count is that there are exactly none.

How many scriptures indicate that a wealthy preacher is part of God's plan? Same answer: None.

- There was the anomalous tithe to Melchisadek, which we've already gone over.
- There was tithing to Levites and offerings to the Aaronite priests in the Old Covenant, being the mandate of a specific contract which expired and is now obsolete.
- There are restrictive references to only basic sustenance and hospitality for God's prophets of old and to His workers in the New Covenant, such as voluntary support of the Apostles (John 12:6) excess of which was in turn used to help the poor (John 13:29, Acts 4:35).

Luke 8:3 “And Joanna the wife of Chuza Herod’s steward, and Susanna, and many others, which ministered unto him of their substance.”

Matt 8:18-19 “And a certain scribe came, and said unto him, Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest. And Jesus saith unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head.”

3John 1:4-8 “I have no greater joy than to hear that my children walk in truth. Beloved, thou doest faithfully whatsoever thou doest to the brethren, and to strangers; [Food and hospitality to itinerant disciples] Which have born witness of thy charity before the church: whom if thou bring forward on their journey after a godly sort, thou shalt do well:
Because that for His name’s sake they went forth, taking nothing of the Gentiles. We therefore ought to receive such, that we might be fellow helpers to the truth.”

This standard of austerity directed by Jesus and adhered to by the Apostles and disciples seems to also have been practiced by the prophets of the Old Covenant (Moses, Num 16:15; Samuel, 1Sam 12:3-4; Elisha, 2Kings 5:15-16).

This concept of giving to God or honoring God by giving spiritual and material comfort to the needy, prisoners, and the downtrodden fits perfectly with the doctrine of brotherly love instructed in the scriptures.

Faith, Hope, and Charity

We have all heard 1Corinthians 13:13 “But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love.”

That word “love” is Strong’s #26 which means benevolence and empathy. The King James Bible in this case is much more accurate when it translates #26 as “charity”. So if you read 1Corinthians 13, understand that every time you run across the word “love”, or in the KJV “charity”, it means empathy and benevolence to a degree that it is as if they were a close family member, or even as if it were your own need, as in “love your neighbor as yourself”.

Tie in this concept with all the previous scriptures about honoring God by helping the needy, and you will see that this is a continuous theme that started in the Old Covenant, but really expands in the New Covenant.

This theme of charitable love certainly does not omit preachers, but it does omit giving to the ones who are not poor. It excludes entirely and without question the charlatanesque preachers of any financial class who misuse their position of trust to deceive or manipulate their listeners for the sake of financial gain.

We hear a lot of preaching about Law-keeping, and even more about faith as being the foundations of Christianity, but this brotherly benevolent love appears to trump them both. Paul states that faith is more important than Law-keeping (Hebrews chapters 10-11, Romans Chapter 3, Galatians Chapter 4, etc), and in 1Corinthians 13:13 he states that this charitable love is even greater than faith.
“And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.”

Charity is greatest because that is where the rubber meets the road - where words and pontification and your faith and hope are put into practice by mastering your materialistic instincts and shelling out some of your cash for a cause that provides nothing visible in return to you.

Matt 19:21, Luke 18:22 and Mark 10:21 – “Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross, and follow me.”

How did we get from those clearly worded instructions about giving to the poor and embracing non-materialism, to what we have today with people finagled into giving a tenth of their income, and willing their estates to preachers and to the church corporations which are supposed to be a spiritually led institutions? Answer: the preachers told them that that is what “giving to God” means.

Do those quoted instructions of Jesus apply to every Christian? To a certain degree yes, and some may want to argue that because they assume that the concept of generosity would drive the giver into total destitution. Don’t forget: in order to give, a person must first be prosperous enough to have something to give. The idea is to bring the poor up to a decent living, not to bring everyone else down to poverty.

There is certainly no argument however, that scriptural instructions calling for total non-materialism certainly do apply to those who claim to seek that “higher calling”: what we would today call “God’s workmen”, “ministers”, “pastors”, “priests”, or in a word - “preachers”: Those who claim a ministerial or leadership status of some sort as a “man of God”.

"The instruction for true preachers is to give up materialism,"

Leading from Behind

If someone wants to be a leader, then guess what? They should lead. Lead by example, and that example is the instructions and behavior of Jesus Christ.

Talking, and shouting, and kvetching at a pulpit is not leading. Complaining about the “evil of the world” or condemning the congregation for their “lack of
obedience” to the preacher, is not leading. Whining about what a tough job it is to be a preacher, is not leading.

True leaders do as they say, and then raise up more leaders, just as Jesus did. They do not surround themselves with ideologically cloned yes men, or create a flock of unquestioning followers that are dependent on the paid preacher for guidance and who cannot effectively think for themselves to defend their own beliefs.

The fact is, that Biblical instruction for true preachers is to give up materialism, just as joining the military entails your loss of freedom and self-direction. This is confirmed by the term “take up the cross” which is an idiom for physical self-discipline and self-denial. Does this sound like the lifestyle of your preacher?

Serial Robbers

By mis-defining the term “Giving to God” and applying the giving part of it to themselves, preachers have robbed God by depriving the poor of the potential gifts that God has instructed, and they have robbed the givers of the treasure in heaven they would have received had their generosity been directed to the poor as scripture indicates.

I mean, is not treasure in heaven the goal of all goals and what everyone is supposed to want? Not a pile of gold and jewels in a cloud, but the treasure of God’s approval - the evidence for a favorable judgment in the afterlife?

This “giving” can also include things like hiring the poor to work, helping to establish them in their own business, fixing their roof, forgiving a loan, and the most common concept that people do not recognize as helping the poor: tipping the waiter/waitress.

More than one pro-tithe preacher has mocked this practice with a jackassism that went something like “you’ll tip a waitress 15%, but you won’t give God 10%?”

Well, yes, Mr. (and Ms.) Preacher, I would because it is much more scriptural to tip the low paid workers than it is to do what you are demanding.

As I have explained above, when preachers say give to God, it really means “give to me (the preacher)”. Preachers like this do not want the pocket change
involved in a tip, they want 10% of a family’s entire income, from every family in the congregation, all year long.

Furthermore, most of them do not actually need it as much as they just plain want it to add to their present abundance and luxury.

The waitress or similar laborer on the other hand is very likely to be on the low end of the economic scale (poor), otherwise they would not be waiting on tables or other low paying job. So a situation like this is a good chance to help someone out, while giving them encouragement and showing them respect for a job well done. This can include anyone like a cleaning lady or a kid that mows your grass. It is the very essence of what the “don’t muzzle the ox” law is talking about, and has absolutely nothing to do with a tenth of your income.

Believe me, that 10-20% unexpected tip has much more of a positive impact on the poor person than it would on the average church business.

Another preacher/prophetess made national news by refusing to pay any gratuity at all, citing the above-quoted preacher’s line of thinking. She then had the waitress fired for not keeping this niggardly act a secret. So this attitude of greed and arrogance is not exactly rare among preachers.

By applying the “always call your opponent what you are” technique made famous by a communist training handbook, preachers spin these observations 180 degrees and say that it’s non-tithers who actually steal from the poor, because they are not paying their “poor tithe”.

As a propaganda ploy they will dress their tithe doctrine in the skirts and aprons of widows and the panda shoes of orphans, and go on and on promoting the idea that people who are anti-tithe are anti-poor, or anti-orphan. I heard this asinine statement put forth by one preacher who was actually proud of his claim that he gave the magnificent sum of 5% of his ill-gotten tithe proceeds to those on his list of needy people.

This is the same modus operandi used by some of the world’s most well-known charities: suck up fortunes in donations; hog the lion’s share for inflated administrative costs (salaries and bonuses to themselves); give a small fraction to the intended cause; and then brag about what a good job they are doing.

This is an iconic example of Luke 16:1-9 and the crafty steward who used his position to steal from his master to gain the good will of the people.
“And he said also unto his disciples, There was a certain rich man, which had a steward; and the
same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods.
And he called him, and said unto him, How is it that I hear this of thee? give an account of thy
stewardship; for thou mayest be no longer steward.
Then the steward said within himself, What shall I do? for my Lord taketh away from me the
stewardship: I cannot dig; to beg I am ashamed. I am resolved what to do, that, when I am put out
of the stewardship, they may receive me into their houses.
So he called every one of his lord’s debtors unto him, and said unto the first, How much owest
thou unto my Lord? And he said, An hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bill,
and sit down quickly, and write fifty.
Then said he to another, And how much owest thou? And he said, An hundred measures of
wheat. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and write fourscore. And the Lord commended the
unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation
wiser than the children of light.
And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when
ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations.”

Basically it is the concept of hush money or buying friends; casting bread upon
the waters to generate a favorable public relations image. In politics it is called
“pork barrel spending” or just “pork”. The concept involves someone giving away a
little money that rightfully belongs to others, in order to buy the good will of
the people for themselves, and to make the people think twice about voicing any
dissent against that person’s shady character. This tactic still works beautifully
to this day. I know a family who in a time of disaster got $500 from the
preacher who reserves 5% of his income for cases like this.
The recipient family thinks this preacher is a great guy and their loyalty to
him has been fortified. They apparently never stopped to realize that this $500
represented $10,000 that the preacher took in through tithes. This family was
actually robbed of $9500.00 that they might have gotten if the preacher taught
his followers the true scriptural means of “giving to God”. As it stands, the
family is happy and the preacher is rich, so what more could you want? The best
scams are the ones that go unidentified.
In a scriptural reality, the numbers should be reversed with the preacher
keeping perhaps as much as the $500 to cover expenses, and the $9500 going
to the needy. Alas, we are not dealing with God's Kingdom on Earth, but instead
with a man-made forgery of that Kingdom. It is a mini-kingdom where the
preachers call the shots by creating their own interpretation and intent of scripture, and God's Word is simply a manipulable prop that is used as a means to an end of achieving the preacher’s personal goals and prosperity, not primarily the ends that Jesus or the Apostles had in mind.

In a nutshell, preachers like this are simply buying friends, honor, respect, and approval with stolen money, just like the unjust steward did.

I may not be a math whizz, but if I was needy I think I would prefer to see the goodwill power of the congregation unleashed, and get ten dollars directly from a concerned Christian, than to have them give it to a preacher who in turn passed on to me only 50 cents (5%) out of that ten dollars.

Ideally, the above mentioned family would have been admonished right from the beginning to create an emergency storehouse for themselves and their neighbors with part of the money that they saved by never tithing in the first place.

I think the word racket is appropriate to describe the “tithe helps the needy” facet of tithe mythology that certain preachers engage in.

On second thought, maybe incredible lie is a better term.

Luke 16:10 to 15 follows up the above scripture thusly: “He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: and he that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much. If therefore ye have not been faithful in [eschewing] the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches [spiritual truth]?

And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man’s, who shall give you that which is your own? No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

And the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things: and they derided him. And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God.”

"Love your neighbor as yourself", which is how we truly “honor God with your wealth”
Like the Pharisees that were just mentioned, today’s preachers will also deride any thought that they need to be non-materialistic in order to be a true man of God.

When asked "who is my neighbor?", Jesus presented the parable of the Good Samaritan in Luke 10:30-37 not only to illustrate the concept of helping others at your own expense as being a virtuous act, but Jesus also pointed out the uselessness and unneighborliness of the professional so-called men of God in the situation. He doubles the insult by portraying the Samaritan (considered at that time to be what today is called mouth-breathing “trailer trash”) as being more virtuous than the pious, high class Pharisees.

Organized churchianity of the time was contradicted and disrespected repeatedly by Jesus, in favor of a loosely structured but closely knit sincere Christian society known as the Body of Christ living according to the Perfect Law of Liberty.

Everything that the Samaritan spent to help the robbed man, could be counted as having been given to God, according to many of the above mentioned scriptures. It all has nothing to do with tithing. Tithing was a totally different activity altogether. The reality of scripture is that giving to God involves the second most important Kingdom concept, according to Jesus, that we have all heard, but may not really take to heart: "Love your neighbor as yourself", which is how we truly “honor God with your wealth” (Proverbs 3:9).

Job 29:12-16 describes the concept and blessings of helping others very well; though he never mentions tithing.

Acts 11:28-29 explains how the new Christians who managed to prosper during a famine each "set apart something for ministering to send unto the brethren in Jerusalem". Again, it was freewill giving; no mention of tithe, not even a poor tithe.

So to answer the question: “Doesn’t ‘Giving to God’ mean ‘giving to the church or to the preacher’?” The answer is a big, fat, unequivocal and emphatic “NO”.

If it is not depicted or instructed in scripture, then why do it? If in fact scripture repeatedly and succinctly condemns the concept of paid preachers, and
indicates nothing more than daily basic necessities for true preachers, how can today’s custom of paying preachers be anything other than a tradition of man?

Flee the Wrath; Malachi’s prophesy of John the Baptist

In Chapter 11 “God Robbers”, the subject was examined regarding Malachi’s prophesy about the future appearance of John the Baptist. Since we now understand the scriptural definition of “giving to God”, we can revisit that prophesy to see what it is all about.

Malachi’s writing is trying to convince a hopelessly corrupt religious establishment to repent. It appears that, almost as if he realized these people were incorrigible, he is given a vision of the future (Malachi 3:1-6) and inserts this future prophesy as a hopeful consolation to the dismal state of affairs that he was addressing in his time. It’s like: “Oh well, we’re in a world of hurt at the moment, but better days will surely come…”

Malachi 3:1-6 reads: “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the LORD, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the LORD of hosts.

But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner’s fire, and like fullers’ soap: And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purge the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the LORD an offering in righteousness.

Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the LORD, as in the days of old, and as in former years. And I will come near to you to judgment; and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and against false swearers, and against those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow, and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger from his right, and fear not me, saith the LORD of hosts. For I am the LORD, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed.

We know for a fact that the first sentence is talking about John the Baptist, because Christ Himself identifies it as such in Matt 11:10 and Luke 7:27. The rest of the first two paragraphs could be describing John or Jesus, as both had the same message and both had a purifying effect on the hearts of their listeners, but this “messenger” spoken of here is almost certainly John the Baptist.
Obviously, John spoke of many soul-reaching concepts to move the hearts of multitudes to repentance and of course, baptism, but the only specific instructions that we have from John concerning personal repentance have to do with compassion for your brethren. Two of these statements were made to tax collectors and soldiers in Luke 3:13-14, and the third statement of instruction in preparation for the Kingdom of God was to the people in general in Luke 3:11 “And the people asked him, saying, What shall we do then? He answereth and saith unto them, He that hath two coats, let him impart to him that hath none; and he that hath meat, let him do likewise.”

Luke 3:7-14 states, according to John the Baptist, a requirement needed in order to flee the coming wrath is to basically give half your substance away to those who are in need. The figure of half may be literal or it may be symbolic, but the concept is apparent - to break the ties to materialism, selfishness, and arrogance based on wealth. These were the vices that the Levites of Malachi’s day were exhibiting. Also, to care for each other and to instill the idea that having anything more than enough to fill your immediate needs is not necessary.

Notice that this material wealth was not directed to go to John, his disciples, the temple, or anything similar that a modern preacher would have tried to pull. John specified “to those who have none”.

In Luke 3:8 John describes this giving as fruits worthy of repentance, but repentance from what? It is apparently repentance from the idolatry of selfishness, materialism, and the arrogance that wealth creates. What else would a prescription like giving your stuff away be meant to cure?

The Pharisees definitely loved money (Luke 16:14), but we can see that John was speaking to the multitudes (which includes us), as well. Apparently the people were not far behind the Pharisees in their sin of materialism and what we call "looking out for #1". Just as it also was in the days of Malachi, and just as it also is today. How could it be otherwise when so many are following materialistic preachers?

When Malachi stated “and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the LORD an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the LORD, as in the days of old, and as in former years.” it was apparently looking forward to a New Covenant time of Godly giving done right - giving with gladness to those in need.
This prophesy describes the happenings of Acts 4:35-37 “And laid them down at the apostles’ feet: and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need.

And Joses, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas, (which is, being interpreted, The son of consolation,) a Levite, and of the country of Cyprus, Having land, sold it, and brought the money, and laid it at the apostles’ feet.”

We have here a specific mention of a purified Levite, as well as other Israelites giving righteous offerings just as Malachi said, and just as God’s messenger (John) had instructed.

So these are not difficult steps to go from Malachi’s prophesy, to John the Baptist and his teachings, to the resulting spiritualism and pleasant, righteous offerings that Malachi spoke of.

Obviously this prophesy has nothing at all to do with validating a New Covenant tithe, since all New Covenant giving described is freewill. For the same reason it appears to have everything to do with a general concept of non-materialism and a purifying of hearts.

To support and confirm this aspect of John’s teachings, notice Luke 19:8 where Zachaeus, obviously sincere and versed in the Law of God states to Jesus: "Behold, Lord, half of my possessions I will give to the poor, and if I have defrauded anyone of anything, I will give back four times as much."

So there you have a New Covenant second witness to giving half of your possessions to the poor as a sign of sincerity, repentance, and commitment; plus the other statements previously mentioned stating that you should give all of what you have to the poor.

We see nothing however, anywhere in scripture that says to give a tenth of your income to a non-Levite preacher. We do not see it because it is not there.

And by the way – when the day comes when you show your preacher that a modern tithe is indisputably a big deception and fraud, is he going to repent and say what Zacheaus said: “if I have defrauded anyone of anything, I will give back four times as much.”? Is your Law-teaching preacher going to sell his investment holdings, and stash of silver, and give back to the congregation four times what he’s taken from them (fraudulently) as tithes?

Even if it was constructive fraud (done inadvertently), Leviticus 5:15, and the rest of Chapter 6 explains that the penalty is to return the principal amount,
plus twenty percent if the crime is done unwittingly. If intentionally, then according to Exodus 22:1 the penalty is *four or five times* the amount stolen. This is what Zacheaus was talking about.

Perhaps the question should really be: Will your Law-teaching preacher return anything at all? Will your “loves God’s Law”, “truth-seeking” preacher return even one phony copper-plated zinc cent as he would surely instruct *you* to do it the situation were reversed? Don’t bet the farm on it.

Additionally, we see in Leviticus 6:2 “If a soul sin, and commit a trespass against the LORD, and lie unto his neighbor in that which was delivered him to keep, or in fellowship, or in a thing taken away by violence, or hath deceived his neighbor;”

So along with it being a common theft from your neighbor to preach a false tithe, it is also an *offense against God* to steal, extort, deceive or defraud your brethren as the tithe doctrine necessitates.

### A Most Critical, Unrecognized Scripture

Getting back to Luke 3:8 - If you think I am making too much of that scripture, or that I am some kind of liberal, daisy-wearing peacenik for pointing out Paul’s emphasis on benevolent charitable love, let us see what Jesus had to say about John’s and Paul’s instructions.

In Mathew 25:34 Jesus says to those that He has put on his right hand "Come ye, the blessed of My Father! Inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

Sounds great, and again, is this not what everyone wants? Is not this the eventual ultimate prize in life that Christians ought to seek? Would you not love to hear those words spoken to you or your family after a plane crash?

So then, who is it that is being addressed in this scripture, and what can we do to be put in the same boat with them? How did they manage to deserve this wonderful reward? Jesus goes on to explain in Matthew 25:35-40 that those who were blessed were the ones who unselfishly gave of their time, effort, and treasure, and had compassion and fed and clothed the needy, the strangers, helped the sick, and visited prisoners.
Again let me point out – no mention of money to a church or preachers. Do you not find that even a little odd? Christ did not mention His preachers because it would have been redundant. His true workers were automatically included with the poor by definition; if they were not materially poor, they were not really His workers.

To make sure there was no misunderstanding, Jesus underscores the importance of His statement by iterating the inverse of what He just said. In the following verses 41-46 he points out that if you do not help your brother in need, and do not feed him, and do not clothe him, etc., you are accursed and doomed to the fires of hell.

See for yourself - Matthew:25:31-46

“When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats:

And he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world:

For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: Naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungred, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw we thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee?

Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me. Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels:

For I was an hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not.

Then shall they also answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these, ye did it not to me.

And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.”
Do you get the idea, from the type of language that he used, that this is a pretty important aspect of achieving God’s Kingdom? It is like a New Covenant version of the blessing and cursing of Deuteronomy 28, but how often have you heard it preached as such? Or have you ever heard it preached in a meaningful, relevant manner? I have not.

No secret meanings. No “kinda, sorta sounds like” fictional nonsense. No manipulative preachercraft shenanigans or hookah smoke of any type needed for you to plainly see what this scripture says, and what it means.

It is the proverbial dead elephant in the living room that many preachers just work around as if it was not there. This scripture is so plain and unambiguous that it can not really be spun to have any other meaning than what it actually says, so it appears to be largely ignored. If anything, it is glossed over in passing, and yet, look at how crucial it is for us to pay attention to.

So, are you going to believe the preachers who claim they would never deceive you when they say “the Kingdom will get here when everyone starts to tithe”, or are you going to believe the words of Jesus Christ saying you will inherit the Kingdom by being kind to the poor and needy?

There is also this misconception floating around that by giving money to the church, they will in turn take care of the poor so that you do not have to worry about it. This is true only to a very limited extent. Like the Pharisees who tithed miniscule amounts of herbs just so they could say they tithed: some churches have just enough of a program so that they can make the claim that they are socially conscious and help the poor. Our philanthropic preacher friend who claimed to give 5% of his ill-gotten gains is a typical example.

Many of these services are window dressing for the church business to create a favorable public relations image to the world. These activities often consist of merely directing the needy to the various government welfare programs which are funded by tax money taken from others who in some cases are less fortunate than those getting the welfare. They are no substitutes for the efficient, scripturally instructed examples of Christians giving, face to face, directly to the needy.
This is not to say that there are no church organizations that are specifically dedicated to helping those in need. I am sure there are, and some may be much better at doing this than others. In these cases they should be happy to (or must, by law) show you their books to show you how much of church income is going to the charitable cause, and how much goes to church overhead.

Only by having this information will you know whether or not it is a worthy cause and if the money that you give to it is truly “going to God” by the scriptural definition.
Chapter 27

Real Men of God Don't Want Money

In Chapter 18 we established the moneyless lifestyle instructed for true Christian preachers. Let us investigate this fact a little further in this chapter as it applied to the Apostles.

Second Corinthians 11:12 “But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion from them which desire occasion; that wherein they glory, they may be found even as we.”

The pro tithers take this verse and interpret it to say that Paul should have been receiving tithe money, but that his opponents would have used this as an excuse to say that Paul was in it for the money in order to discredit him. So Paul chose not to take the money that he “really would have liked to have gotten”; and that the servants of Satan were the ones who were causing Paul to hold off on getting the money that was due him.

After all, a successful preacher should be a financially successful preacher, according to the conventional worldly standards of today’s preachers.

By reading the scripture in context we see that the events were in fact the exact opposite of the pro-tithe description of what was happening. Paul had the integrity to obey the instructions of poverty that prevented false teachers from claiming equal standing with the true workers of God.

It was these opponents of Paul who wanted him to take the money, just as today’s pro-tithe preachers want you to think that Paul wanted to take the money. The reason being that the false teachers of Paul’s time (as well as those of today) could then “be regarded just as we [Paul, etc] are”.

2Corinthians 10:12 “For we dare not make ourselves of the number, or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves: but they measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise.”
Paul dreaded the thought of being compared in any way to the self-promoting, worldly preachers of his day.

The second half of that scripture describes hireling preachers who compare themselves only to other hireling preachers of their own ilk. By doing this they can make themselves look ideally qualified to represent God and His Word, but only because they will not ever seriously compare themselves to the clear standards that scripture has set for men claiming such a position.

If Paul abandoned the non-materialistic life style, it would remove one of the big differentiations that set him and his associates apart from the false preachers. If Paul allowed himself to fall to the worldly levels of his opposition, then they would all preach, and the standard would have been set for preachers to take money for preaching. Thus, in the eyes of the listeners the false preachers would have been considered just as Godly and on somewhat equal terms with Paul and the other true preachers, because the un-Godly standard of a paid preacher would then have been established.

Apparently that is what the false preachers have always wanted: To be considered just as Godly and credible as the genuine men of God, while they evade the standard of non-materialism set by the true prophets of old that had been carried over to the New Covenant. Once they have achieved that façade of legitimacy, they could then exploit that trust, “abuse their power in the gospel”, and promote their false doctrines all day long, while getting wealthy doing so.

If the prohibition remained, there would always be a distinct delineation between the commercial religious speakers and the true men of God that would clearly identify who was who.

Paul cut off the false preachers' chance at being equal by sticking true to the instructions of Jesus for His workers. The adherence to which would evermore be the mark of a true man of God, but which is considered as absurd, even impossible by preachers (and many congregations) today.

2Timothy 3:4-5 speaks of such doubters: "Traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof:"

Paul, Peter, Timothy, and other men throughout history have proven that it is not absurd nor is it impossible to live such a life devoted to God: shunning shallow worldly pleasures in favor of spiritual fulfillment, while acknowledging the power of God to provide for their needs day after day after day.
Second Corinthians 12:9-10 "And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.

Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ’s sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong."

2 Corinthians 4:16-18 “For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory; While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal.”

These men were tough, disciplined, and devoted. Paul is discussing the concept of hardships that are willingly, even eagerly endured as being a source of power to a man of God. That word "distresses" above, means dire material need, or poverty. This agrees with the statement that Jesus made in Matthew 17:21 and Mark 9:29 indicating that prayer is enhanced by fasting (physical deprivation).

So if worldly deprivation, or weakness, empowers spiritual reception and understanding, then what does worldly (financial) strength, comfort, and self-indulgence of modern preachers lead to?

What do you think Paul meant when in 1 Corinthians 4:15 he said "For though ye have ten thousand instructers in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers [role models]?"

Here in a few verses is a description of God’s true ministers:

2 Corinthians 6:4-10 “Giving no offense in any thing, that the ministry be not blamed:

But in all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, In stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labors, in watchings, in fastings; By pureness, by knowledge, by longsuffering, by kindness, by the Holy Ghost, by love unfeigned, By the word of truth, by the power of God, by the armor of righteousness on the right hand and on the left.

By honor and dishonor, by evil report and good report: as deceivers, and yet true; As unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and, behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; As sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.”

I guess Paul forgot to mention the part about collecting tithe money, vacations, investment in stocks, fishing trips, real estate holdings and all the other perks that come with “surrendering all for Christ” and becoming a preacher.
Proverbs 13:7 is a lesson to remember: “There is that maketh himself rich, yet hath nothing: there is that maketh himself poor, yet hath great riches.” **Faith and attitude is the source of contentment and spiritual riches for some people, not money.**

Worldliness is a natural tendency to begin with, but the art of advertising and social manipulation has made it a *learned vice* for many today; even an addiction for some. Materialistic desires have been taken to extremes unimagined a hundred years ago. It has also led to suicides, depression and unhappiness, even among the wealthy, in numbers unheard of in the past century.

Luke 6:20-24, "And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said, **Blessed be ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God.** Blessed are ye that hunger now: for ye shall be filled. Blessed are ye that weep now: for ye shall laugh. Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man’s sake.

Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy: for, behold, your reward is great in heaven: for in the like manner did their fathers unto the prophets.

But woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation."

Jesus said that the hungry will be filled, and those who weep shall laugh, etc; in other words their suffering will be alleviated by obtaining that which they lack. In Luke 6:20 He said “blessed are ye poor, for yours is the Kingdom of Heaven.”

Have you ever wondered why it does not say “blessed are the poor, for they shall become rich”? That word “poor” means dirt poor - owning nearly nothing like a pauper.

Or why does it not say “Blessed are the **rich**, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven”?

Becoming materially rich may be fine if it happens while maintaining Christian principles, but it is not something that should be a primary purpose of life for Christians, nor should it be achieved at the price of detriment of others.

This may give a frame of reference as to why Paul chose poverty over wealth. It shows where his priorities were. But today’s pro-tithers seek the unjust wealth generated by the modern tithe doctrine, so what is *fundamentally wrong* with this picture? What spirit is actually ruling these "spiritual leaders" who are seeking these enormous sums of tithe money?
2Corinthians 12:14 backs up the above point by saying “I come not for yours, but you”; which in other translations reads “I come not for your wealth, but you”.

If you read on through verse 19, it more clearly establishes the point that Paul did not want wealth.

That is why, when Paul was presented with supplies from the church of Macedonia, and he was in a situation that required him to accept those supplies, in 2Corinthians 11:8 Paul used the term “I robbed [also “plundered”, “despoiled”, “defrauded”, depending on translation] other churches, taking wages of them, to do you service.”

Is that not an odd way for him to state the situation if he felt he had it coming as today’s preachers claim they do? They say they are being robbed if they do not get support.

Paul apparently had reason to believe that he was not entitled to receive material that he had not directly earned through service.

What about that word “wages” that Paul used. The pro-tithers are pretty quiet about that one. In their quest for indications that New Covenant workers should be paid money, you can rest completely assured that they have extensively strip-mined the scriptures and checked the original Greek for this word hoping to find any kind of monetary connotation to use in exploiting that phrase.

The Greek word for “wages” is Strong’s Concordance #3800: “neut. of a presumed der. of the same as #3795; rations for a soldier, i.e. (by extens) his stipend or pay:- wages”.

I do not think I need to elaborate too much on the fact that soldiers got basic food, clothing, medical help, and shelter as their “wages” through most of history, and though some money may have been added to that, it was minimal, amounting to little more than pocket money. It certainly would not be considered a lavish, or even materially comfortable lifestyle.

This also ties in with Paul’s view of himself and fellow workers as “soldiers” (Philippians 2:25, Philemon 1:2).

That term “(by extens)” means “by extension”. This indicates that in certain cases one could assume, or read into that word an indication of money, but that
is only an assumption. "Stipend or pay" is a term that can also be referring to an allotment of food or other such items. For example some 18th century sailors were paid in rum, not money, but it was still called their payment.

Money is not the primary meaning of #3800 which, as it states, means “rations of a soldier”, so that scripture should more accurately read: “I robbed other churches, taking my rations of them, to do you service.”

Second Timothy 2:3-4 confirms this clearly “Thou therefore endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life; that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier.”

This description of a soldier’s wage matches exactly with Jesus’ instructions to his disciples in Luke 10:7 in which Jesus says "Therefore said he unto them, The harvest truly is great, but the laborers are few: pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth laborers into his harvest.

Go your ways: behold, I send you forth as lambs among wolves. Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes: and salute no man by the way. And into whatsoever house ye enter, first say, Peace be to this house. And if the son of peace be there, your peace shall rest upon it: if not, it shall turn to you again.

And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the laborer is worthy of his hire. Go not from house to house.

And into whatsoever city ye enter, and they receive you, eat such things as are set before you:”

So we can see that words like “ration” or “stipend” which define the word “wages” as Paul uses it, are pretty accurate, according to what Jesus instructs.

This Greek word #3800 is used only two other times in the New Covenant. Once, as we might expect, in Luke 3:14 “And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages.”

And once metaphorically in Romans 6:23 “For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

In 2Corinthians 7:2 Paul wrote “Receive us; we have wronged no man, we have corrupted no man, we have defrauded no man”.

What did Paul mean when he said that they “defrauded” no man? In the context of all of his writings it means he accepted no money or material profit under any false pretenses for preaching God’s Word.

I do not intend to dissect every comment of scripture on the subject, because I think you get the picture. Once you start to read scripture for what it says, you will often see this message about non-materialistic humility for God’s
workers, as well as the scriptural condemnation of both the crooked preachers and the preacher/money matrix that exists today. In fact Scripture is actually kinder to tax collectors and prostitutes than it is to worldly preachers (priests, false prophets, etc.) as a whole (Matt 21:31).

We do not even need to go into the subject of Pharisees, or other Old Covenant corrupt priests and scriptural “dumb greedy dog” examples such as Isaiah 56:11, or the whole chapter of Ezekiel 34; we would be here all day.

The point is that God had a high non-materialistic standard for His prophets and teachers in the first place, and He continued those standards going from the Old Covenant to the New. He has given us examples for all of us to strive to match, but particularly for His workers to live up to. It appears that a replay of the Levitical corruption and Pharisaical arrogance and greed is not the intended outcome of the New Covenant teachings. Yet, look around; look around objectively, what do you see today?

Many contemporary preachers in pulpits (every single one that I have gotten to know, actually), regardless of their preaching on other issues have ignored God’s prohibitions and non-materialistic restrictions for His workmen, and have pursued preaching as a business career and means of profit.

Make no mistake:

These are the kinds of preachers that Jesus, Paul, Peter, James John and Jude warned us about.

Do not be astonished like they were in Mark 11:18, when the moneychangers were evicted from the temple. As you can see, I am not promoting the "crooked preacher" concept because I sat in the dark of the new moon and just decided to make it up. Scripture backs up this idea plentifully, and living examples in modern society demonstrate the fact all too clearly.

1Corinthians 4:1-2 says: “Let a man regard us in...don't confuse a preacher like this who is a commercial businessman in the religion business, with a scripturally defined man of God."
this manner, as servants of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God. In this case moreover it is required of stewards that one be found trustworthy.”

**Titus 1:7** – “For an overseer must be above reproach as God’s steward; not self-willed, not soon angry, not a wine-bibber, no striker, **not fond of filthy lucre;**”

Keep in mind that if someone is willing to intentionally deceive and conceal truth in order to obtain more money, you can safely assume that he cannot be “found trustworthy” and that he’s also “fond of filthy lucre”, and is the type of person these scriptures are referring to.

The term "self willed" refers to the junk preaching that we so often encounter which falls outside of the bounds of scripture; biased interpolations and sophistry used to support the preacher's desired (self willed) conclusions.

**Free Market Economy**

If your preacher wants to be paid, or wants to sell books or tapes, etc. that is up to him. It is a free entrepreneurial market, just like the moneychangers were involved in – making a buck the best way they knew how.

These preachers may have good teachings from time to time, even excellent, but that is all part of the game. They pretty much have to preach some truth in order to establish a basis of credibility to work from. Do not assume however, that he has anywhere near the truth he claims to have just because he is a preacher, or quotes the Bible, or makes you feel good.

Moreover and perhaps more importantly, do not make the mistake of confusing a preacher like this who is a commercial businessman in the religion business, with a scripturally defined man of God. Nor should you feel in any way that you owe the same heed and respect to the former that legitimately belongs to the Godly position and status of the latter.

And whatever you do, never let yourself think that you owe either one of them 10% of your income. The preacher does not deserve it, and the true man of God will not take anything identified as “tithe” because they would have a much higher moral standard than that.

Nor should you ever think that even your freewill gifts of money to a man’s business can in any way be construed as “giving to God”, just because his proprietorship or corporation happens to be in the religion industry.
The setting, the pomp and ceremony, the preaching techniques, the “feel good” mood; they are all based more on industrial psychology principles of manipulation than on spiritual truth or a calling from God.

Chapter 28
The REAL God-robbers – Literally.

"But refuse profane and old wives’ fables, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness." – 1 Tim 4:7

The definition of God robber according to pro-tithe churchianity, is: "Anyone who does not give at least ten percent of their income to a preacher or church."

Let us forget the “God robber” name-calling tactics of pro-tithe preachers, and instead let Jesus himself identify for you who the real modern day God-robbers are by recognizing the importance of God’s apparent fondness for what appears to be His “chosen of the chosen people”, aka: the faithful poor and humble.

In Matthew 25:34-46 Jesus clearly identified himself with the least fortunate of the Israel people. “Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these, the least of my brethren, ye have done it unto me”;

This is speaking of those who chose to either help, or to neglect the poor.

In other words, if you choose to feed or help a poor man or his family, it is counted as if you are vicariously feeding or helping a hungry Jesus (God incarnate) himself.

Charitable empathy should be a major Christian concept. After all, scripture tells us that helping those in need achieves any or all of the conditions included on the following partial list:

• Gains blessing and deliverance from God (Luke 11:41)
• Gains treasure in Heaven (Luke 12:33)
• Shows your obedience to the gospel (2Corinthians 9:12-13)
• Helps to detach us from worldly desires (James 1:27)
• Achieves a valid means of honoring God (Proverbs 14:31)
• Is a true venue to express love and appreciation for Jesus in a manner that He Himself specified. Thus, it puts you a step closer to His right hand side in the Kingdom and a step further away from everlasting fire. (Matt 25:40)

Proverbs 14:31 says that you honor God by helping the poor (not the preacher). That is how scripture defines giving to God. Proverbs 28:27 and 29:7 support the idea.

Paul, as one example, gives diligence and priority to helping the poor in Galatians 2:9-10. He states that the Apostles John, James, and Peter insisted upon it.

Acts 6:2-4 indicates that the Apostles were spending so much time helping the poor that they didn’t have time to teach the Word. They did not just quit helping others because of this; instead they made sure these programs continued, by delegating to others these duties of feeding the poor. This responsibility was not just conferred to anyone, but to those exhibiting the selfless spirit needed to do the job right; those who enjoyed being of service. This indicates that helping others materially and in sincerity was a major feature of their ministry and not just something to push off on to undedicated lackeys.

We can better understand and apply the concept of Matthew 25:40 to our lives regarding the tithe subject, if we turn it around and paraphrase: “Inasmuch as you defrauded and robbed these, the least of my brethren, ye have defrauded and robbed Me” (God in the flesh).

In other words, those who neglect or refuse to help the needy are robbing Jesus. Whether or not they give to a church or preacher is completely irrelevant.

Those who convince people that “Giving to God” means giving to preachers or church organizations instead of giving to the poor, are robbing Jesus (God) and the defrauding the people.

Even an average, non-tithe, hireling preacher who simply asks for gifts or donations instead of a tithe, but fails to fully inform the congregation by routinely teaching the instructions of Matt 25 about the priority of giving to the
poor *first*; are by their neglect and omission, tacitly engaging in the God-robbing.

The flipside of that concept is that anyone, preacher or not, feigning poverty or need in order to take advantage of the generosity of others is likewise robbing God.

Preachers are personally responsible for the fraud of their teachings, since they know better or *should know* better than to promote a tithe. Their lack of plausible denial is in direct proportion to how heavily they have promoted themselves as being “rulers”, “authorities”, “seers”, “prophets”, “Law teachers”, "Doctors of Divinity", or Bible college graduates, etc. as a means of creating leverage over others.

1Peter 5:21 "I solemnly charge you in the presence of God and of Christ Jesus and of His chosen angels, to maintain these principles without bias, *doing nothing in a spirit of partiality.*"

John 9:39-41 “And Jesus said, For judgment came I into this world, that they that see not may see; and that they that see may become blind.

Those of the Pharisees who were with him heard these things, and said unto him, Are we also blind? Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye would have no sin: but *now ye say, We see: your sin remaineth.*”

If preachers said “hey, I’m as clueless as the rest of you, but here is my opinion...” that would be one thing. However, just as in the scripture quoted above, today’s preachers also say “we see” by the self-promoted presupposition that they know what they are talking about. That is what they base their elevated position as preacher upon.

By proclaiming their perceived superior scriptural understanding and by asserting their alleged authority as a *pastor* or other religious leader, they are also imputing to themselves the responsibility that what they are teaching is in fact scripturally accurate. They are also accepting responsibility for the consequences of their preaching, whether good or bad. That word “remaineth” in the above scripture means that it stays permanently, like a tattoo. So false teaching is a sin that is not to be taken lightly.

Zechariah 13:3-6 "And it shall come to pass that, when any shall yet prophesy, then
his father and his mother that begat him shall say unto him, Thou shalt not live; for thou speakest lies in the name of Jehovah; and his father and his mother that begat him shall thrust him through when he prophesieth.

And it shall come to pass in that day, that the prophets shall be ashamed every one of his vision, when he prophesieth; neither shall they wear a hairy mantle to deceive: but he shall say, I am no prophet, I am a tiller of the ground; for I have been made a bondman from my youth.

And one shall say unto him, What are these wounds between thine arms? Then he shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends."

When the truth of this becomes known and people want accountability, don't be surprised if the preachers try to slide off the rock and evade all responsibility for this false doctrine that they so adamantly promoted in the past. "Me? A preacher? No, I'm a ...farmer, yeah, that's the ticket. I'm a farmer and never was a preacher... I must just look like him... you got the wrong guy!"

James 3:13-15 "Who among you is wise and understanding? Let him show by his good behavior his deeds in the gentleness of wisdom. But if you have bitter jealousy and selfish ambition in your heart, do not be arrogant and so lie against the truth.

This wisdom is not that which comes down from above, but is earthly, natural, demonic.

James is talking about leading by example. "Selfish ambition" includes seeking materialistic wealth, and it would certainly tie in to the act of promoting a fraudulent tithe when it mentions those who "lie against the truth". I mean, this is a pretty straightforward scripture, so let us apply it to those who claim to have wisdom or authority.

Acts 8:20-21 “But Peter said unto him, Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased [or sold] with money. Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God.”

Trust Them Not

I will guess that by now you have picked up on the idea that I am not too keen on the integrity of these people who preach, and who claim to be Christian "authorities" or "leaders", and you are right. I place them quite low on the totem pole of respectability and trustworthiness, and I think you should do the same. That is because as previously shown, there are so many hireling impostors
in preaching positions today that the default prejudice has to be "untrustworthy until proven otherwise".

Just as politicians, and various law enforcement persons are traitors to the Constitution that they had sworn to uphold, so also do paid preachers disregard the constraints and accountability put on them by the scriptures from the very Bible that they claim to love and teach.

I abide by Paul’s instruction of "honor to whom honor is due" (Romans 13:7), which indicates that honor is not due to just anyone and everyone. His instructions imply that honorability must first be demonstrated, or at least that indications of dishonorable traits in that person should be absent.

Conversely, a predisposition of many people to believe the speaker makes that audience easy meat for a deceiver. Prudence dictates that anyone trying to influence others should be eyed with suspicion and kept at an arms length, particularly if they have something to gain by it one way or another. Wariness or even cynicism is a healthier approach than having an ambivalent opinion or a low standard for acceptance of information as fact. At least a suspicious posture enables a person to judge what is said more critically and thus more honestly than if they were encumbered with the sense-dulling condition of friendship or trust of the preacher.

Gideon for example, was instructed to pick only the wary men for his mission (Judges 7:5-6), yet I see groups with Gideon nicknames ("Gideon Army", "Gideon Elite", etc) who are so un-wary (of their preachers) it is ridiculous. The responsible thing to do, hard as it may be for some, is to keep your emotional distance from your preacher. Then again, this may not be all that difficult, since intelligent, pointed, rational questioning of his teachings will make the preacher want to keep his distance from you.

People tend to believe what they want to believe, and they want to believe that a friend would not lie to them. This relationship results in lots of mental excuses for the preacher's behavior, and a minimum of questions as to his questionable doctrines. It certainly causes any verbalized doubt as to his basic integrity or motives to be strictly verboten. I mean, saying something like "It appears that you are a liar and a thief." is not exactly the best way to maintain a friendship. So make Truth your best friend, and let those of perceived authority fall in line behind it where they may.
In the face of questionable teachings, inaction on your part is an action; one that you are accountable for. By giving any preacher a pass on teachings that you have contrary evidence for, you become a partner to the false teachings. Your silence gives your consent, as they say. That being said, do not expect any changes to their behavior as a result of your critical input, except to the extent that you have washed your hands of their sin. You can let them prove to you which side of the fence they are on. Five will get you ten that they continue their false teachings.

Godrobbing Preachers Rob You Too

We have covered the numerous scriptures indicating that, as a spiritual matter, blessing comes from your act of giving and caring for the needs of others, (“It is more blessed to give than to receive” Acts 20:35). As we have seen, the concept of giving to any preacher, just because he is a preacher, does not harmonize with any of these scriptures at all.

Not unless he happens to be poor, sincere, and has sacrificed what he had for the sake of his ministry much like the Apostles did, and as described in Matthew Chapter 10. If he has enough to maintain his daily needs and cover his expenses of helping others, that is all he should want, and that is all that scripture allows.

If and when the time comes that you do meet a true man of God like that, your support for them would be invaluable. It makes those who provide such basic kindness a co-heir with that Godly person’s reward.

Matthew 10:41-42 “He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet’s reward; and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man’s reward.

And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little [humble] ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward.

This obviously has nothing to do with today’s paid preachers, however.

The Big Question that must be asked is: Could it possibly be, that the reason the scriptural emphasis on helping and giving to each other, particularly Matthew 25, is so extremely under-stated if not totally ignored by preachers,
is because they feel that if we understood it, it might cause us to divert tithe money to the poor, as the Word instructs, and away from the preachers?

In other words: Their weekly take might be less if preachers are no longer the main object of your giving efforts because you instead followed the instructions of Jesus on giving to the needy. Alternatively, the preacher will make more money if they preach the tithe, or if they preach the fallacy that giving to the church organization is in some way synonymous with giving to God.

The financial gain that is the result of you giving to them, is at the direct expense of the scripturally promised blessing that you would have gotten, had you instead given to the poor.

So then, what is the moral heritage of "honoring God with your wealth" as instructed by scripture, as opposed to modern man-made tithing?

If you honor God by unselfishly helping others, you are blessed with the treasure in Heaven as promised in scripture, as God sees all that you do. The other person is blessed materially by what you have given them, and may some day help you or others in return. They then ask for blessings upon you in their prayers in addition to your initial blessing from God. Do not underestimate the power of the blessings, good will, and prayers that people have for others.

Do you really think that the automatic word of thanks from the preacher, or the generic form letter and tax receipt from the church office acknowledging your tithe money, holds an equal spiritual weight as the heartfelt appreciation of the truly needy?

How can tithing or giving to a preacher achieve a spiritual benefit, when it is not scriptural? It really makes no practical sense at all. It is no more scriptural or spiritually beneficial than if you bought the Brooklyn Bridge from your preacher. That is because in either case all you are paying for is a story; a belief, valid or not, that you have gained something by hearing the preacher’s spiel. You can rationalize all you want as to the supposed benefits of this tither/preacher transaction, but they are only man-made reasoning and self-delusion. Pro-tithe assertions as to a supposed beneficial effect of tithing are often only opinions expressing exaggerated claims, misrepresented scriptures, and having no true validity whatsoever.

Tithing may in some cases give a good feeling that an alleged obligation has been fulfilled and thus lifted from the shoulders of the giver, but it gains no
more of a true blessing than does giving to the presidential election fund. Like
dogs barking up the wrong tree, your good intentions alone do not count.

Just as Matthew 10:41 extends the reward of the holy men to those who
gave them physical support, so also would we expect that those who support the
false preachers to have a share in their reward.

The preacher gains the money that you give him. He pays his bills and keeps
the rest; giving a very small fraction of that to the needy. They then bless him
because they think he is such a great guy for giving them a pittance of what
they might have gotten from you if you had known and acted upon your true
scriptural obligation in the first place.

So by tithing or giving to a preacher, you have allowed this giant parasitic
leech to plop himself right smack into the middle of God's plan. This entity is
detrimental to both the givers and to the valid would-be receivers, since both
suffer for the sake of the middleman: the preacher. He sucks up 95% of the
benefit to the needy, while short circuiting and destroying the proper blessing
flow that is supposed to go to the givers. Very much like government welfare
systems do.

Anyone who tithes regularly, but is ignorant of, or minimizes Matthew 25:34-46
with its priority to compassion for the needy and the associated
ramifications, will have been robbed of any commendation that they might
otherwise have had for themselves when it comes time for the Judgement; they
lost their treasure in Heaven because they made their deposits into the wrong
account.

“But Judge, I tithed every single week...” they might say. Then the Judge
says “...and your point is? What has that got to do with the price of beans,
righteousness, and what I clearly instructed? I told you how to inherit the
Kingdom in plain language. I even emphasized it by pointing out what will happen
if you don't do it. You chose instead to idolize and gain social acceptance with
your false preacher more than you believed my instructions. Next case...”
Chapter 29
Sin in the Camp - The Tithe is Detrimental to the Spiritual Growth and Blessings of the Congregation

Ecclesiastes 10:1  “Dead flies cause the oil of the perfumer to send forth an evil odor; so doth a little folly outweigh wisdom and honor.”

It does not seem to take much to mess up a good thing. I said in the last chapter that good intentions alone do not count. Moses could not enter the Promised Land because he hit the rock not once but twice (Numbers 20:11-12). Saul lost his kingship because he thought he was doing something good when he offered up an unauthorized sacrifice to God (1Samuel 13:11-14). Today people tithe, while they lose their land, their freedom, their culture, and the very essence of their Christian religion to invaders and occupational governments.

All three of these are examples of people who did not intend to do wrong, but did.

It is even worse if the sin is intentional. If you read the story in Joshua 7:6-26 you will see that the armies of Israel were defeated and thousands dead because of the sin of one man’s deliberate act of materialistic greed.

If the deliberate sin of one average person can negatively affect God’s blessing on the entire group, would not that principle apply to any disobedience by the acknowledged leader of a group (the preacher)? Would a preacher who defies God’s clear instructions of non-materialism have a similar negative effect on the group today?
Joshua 7:12  “Therefore the children of Israel could not stand before their enemies, but turned their backs before their enemies, because they were accursed: neither will I be with you any more, except ye destroy the accursed from among you.”

Is the spirit of Gehazi any less reprehensible today than it was in Elisha's day? (2Kings 5:20) Yet, people today not only allow, but are proud of the fact that their preacher is financially wealthy.

If you have a materialistic, paid preacher, no matter how smooth and personable; whether he promotes the tithe or not; you have a sin in your camp that everyone in that camp will be affected by.

The materialism and worldliness that is ubiquitous to preachers is a red flag that may indicate just the tip of the iceberg of what else is in his heart, and the amount of error in his other teachings. You will know soon enough if you keep your eyes and ears open to his teachings.

Matthew 23:8-12 “But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven.  
Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.”

If you no longer feel the need to idolize and submit to the authority of a leader, rabbi, guru, pastor, or reverend, but you still feel that you need to continue to attend his weekly church deal for social purposes, that is understandable. Keep in mind however that even if you unsubscribe from the preacher’s headship, you are still just as morally responsible for their sin if you give them any personal monetary or moral support at all.

The Tithe is Detrimental to the Financial Prosperity of the Christian Community

Aside from the spiritual cost of the tithe that has been outlined, comes the worldly, financial cost to the families of the community. We are not supposed to be so materialistic that we wrangle and dispute over petty issues of money of course, but we are also not supposed to acquiesce to becoming a sheep on some wolf’s dinner plate either.
The wealth and prosperity of the preacher or church corporation did not come floating down from Heaven on a parachute. The wealth of those religious entrepreneurs comes at the direct expense of the congregation members who worked to obtain that wealth.

Any time you have an established practice of drawing off the wealth of a community and concentrating it in the hands of a few, you will have unwarranted misery and difficulty for the general population of producers. Whether it is high taxes or its offshoot the professional welfare class, price gauging oil companies, banks imposing usury or diluting the money value through inflationary money creation, or a bad public school system; life-sucking entities like these are a bane to a healthy society.

Prosperity depends on a free flow of circulating cash from one person to the next, to the next, and eventually some goes back to the person who spent it in the first place. This cycle is hampered when an unwarranted amount of money is continually bled from that community.

The tax money goes away with little returned, the oil profits go to the corporation with only a few low paying jobs at the local gas station to show for it. The banks, well, they are just a cancer on society. They are designed to suck wealth out of the community; that is their purpose. Public schools seem to be black holes designed to suck up money, and which provide a net negative educational result rather than positive.

Your friendly preacher siphoning off ten percent of your production is no different than the others on that list, except for the fact that the preacher commits his sin while doing it in God’s name which makes it all the more repugnant. Tithe money rarely returns to the people that it came from. Preachers seldom spend this money back into the congregation because they have to feign a perpetual shortage of money in order to keep up the inflow of cash. If they spent the money back into the local community like a drunken sailor, it would not take long for the congregation to realize “hey, that guy is loaded, and it’s on our money.”

The preacher’s wealth needs to remain hidden, to disappear as if it really did “go to God”. Therefore it is spent or

"A wealthy Christian preacher is, scripturally speaking, an oxymoron."
invested *outside* of the community that it came from in order to avoid detection.

Obviously, the more money siphoned off from each family, the less money that is left for them to improve their lot, build a business, enjoy some comforts, or in some cases even to feed themselves. With discretionary spending being very limited as it is in today's economy, a ten percent clipping by a church leaves virtually nothing for some people to use for legitimate charitable purposes.

**Pay Them What is Due**

The paradox is this: even if you have the best, most selfless, non-materialistic preacher since John the Baptist, you can not rightfully give him, nor should he accept more than his daily needs of a good meal, a place to stay, and basic material possessions.

Beyond that, you can honor them by taking the money that you *would have* given them, had they not been bound by scriptural instructions, and giving it instead to your brothers and sisters in need. That is a basic template for God's Kingdom here on Earth. A *wealthy Christian preacher* is, scripturally speaking, an oxymoron.

But what if you do not have the best, most selfless, non-materialistic preacher since John the Baptist?

Well, let us consider this in a progressive, point-by-point basis:

First, would you say that a good case has been made for the idea that tithing today is absolutely not scriptural? Have we proven that scripture does not support a modern tithe *at all*, and that the pro-tithe arguments by their very nature have shown themselves to be rather easily debunked?

I will assume that if you have read this far, you answered affirmatively, because there was not a single Christian that I have given this information to personally, whether they were pro-tithe or not, that could dispute any of the scriptural evidence or conclusions presented. The resistance was and is *solely*
from preachers, and you have seen in this book the best of the responses they have come up with.

Rather than having the integrity to accept the facts, and having the dignity to adjust their doctrine to the truth, they have instead doubled down on both the volume and dubious nature of their disproven pro-tithe propaganda much like the Pharisees did in response to New Covenant teachings.

The arguments that I have addressed and refuted do not come from incapable or unintelligent men. These arguments, bad as they are, are the result of someone trying to prove something as being true, when all the facts point in the other direction. When they put forth the embarrassing, nonsensical arguments as they have, it is because they are working with the best they can find, but in reality there is nothing to find as valid support for their position. Even, as mentioned in the introduction, they have at their disposal an accumulation of the best pro-tithe arguments that the church world has come up with over the past thousand years or more.

Authentic scriptural evidence to support a modern tithe simply does not exist. So we end up with the best lies, creations, and manipulation that their word-smithing trade can provide.

1Peter 3:15 "But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts: and be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear:"

Colossians 4:6 "Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man."

Far be it from me to get between a preacher and his pork, but doctrines based on truth just do not need the kind of extravagant hokum that is employed in pulling the tithe wool over everyone’s eyes. No preacher should have to spend sleepless nights wracking their brain to try to find some angle to play, or some remotely translated term of scripture, or some psychological pressure point to push. They should not have to stress out over how that can all be run through the sausage grinder of rationalization and deception in order to come out as a fabricated excuse to convince themselves and others that their false tithe doctrine is true.

Truth may fall right into your lap, or it may take some effort to find, but it is never made up. A little truth cannot be respectably replaced by a large
volume of stagecraft and non-truth, but that is exactly what the pro-tithe doctrine relies on.

This tithe doctrine is not a natural conclusion to draw from the flow of information that scripture openly presents. It appears to be obvious that the entire pro-tithe presentation; the "precedents", the "models", the "kinda, sorta, almost sounds like" fabrications - even the spin applied to Abraham's tithe event, are all desperate efforts to preserve this false doctrine at the expense of blaspheming God by mocking the truth.

The strained, tenuous nature of their assertions begs the question that is even larger than that of the tithe's validity. That question is this: Is this false doctrine a result of honest error, brainwashing, and narrow-mindedness; or is it a concerted, deliberate deception willfully engaged in by all of those who promote it? That question can only be answered one preacher or church board at a time.

So if you agree with the case that I have presented against tithing - one that I think any rational, unbiased person would have to agree with, then it is your turn, folks. Talk to your preacher. If, after hearing the points given in this material, he cannot provide very sound, plausible reasons to you as to why this information is inaccurate, or if they cannot thoroughly validate their pro-tithe position from scripture in a legitimate manner, and do it with more competence and integrity than any of "my" preachers have done, then he should willingly admit his mistake and change his doctrine on this subject. If he is bound by obstinate corporate doctrine to promote the tithe, then he should resign as preacher, and you should leave that church.

John 4:23-24 “But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth: for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.”

2Corinthians 13:8 “For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth.”

Ephesians 4:25 “Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbor: for we are members one of another.”

1John 3:18 “My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth.”

Matt 18:15 “Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother.”
John 8:44 “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.”

As Christian co-members of the Body of Christ, we should each be beneficial to each other and thus be beneficial to the Body as a whole, just as the various parts of the human body are. Anyone claiming to be a member, but who deceives others for their own benefit at the expense of the body can be more accurately likened to a cancerous cell or a parasite rather than a true part of the body, and should be regarded as such.

If your preacher will not repent of this false pro-tithe teaching, and yet cannot prove a pro-tithe case, then you have to decide: Do you stick with this deceitful preacher out of habit, or because he is such a nice guy, or because that is where all your friends hang out on Sunday and you value the social experience of listening to him more than you value truth? Or do you heed the words of Jesus when he said to His disciples in Luke 16:9-13: “Would I say unto you, ‘Make yourselves friends of riches of unrighteousness; so that, when they fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations?’

He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much: and he that is unrighteous in the least is unrighteous also in much.

If therefore ye have not been faithful in rejecting the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches? [spiritual insight, healing, etc.]

And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another man’s [taking his money], who shall give you that which is your own? [spiritual understanding, treasure in heaven]”

He is basically saying “play by the rules or get out of the game”.

Continuing the scripture: “No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.

And the Pharisees also, who were covetous, heard all these things: and they derided him.

And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men [with bogus justifications for false doctrines]; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly
esteemed among men [religious bigwigs seeking financial wealth] is abomination in the sight of God.”

In other words: If you have a Gehazi-type preacher who is unrepentant of lying to you about the tithe, what else is he lying to you about? Why would God give him any true spiritual insight, or pour out the Holy Spirit on your congregation, when your leader is ruled by an unclean spirit, and/or serving another god? Why would you associate with a preacher who esteems his personal wealth over the truth? Paul told us not to even fellowship with people like this, let alone pay him to teach us God’s Word.

John 14:23-24 “Jesus answered and said unto him, If a man love me, he will keep my word: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him. He that loveth me not keepeth not my words: and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father’s who sent me.”

2Thessalonians 2:10-12 "And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness".

So at worst, you will go down in flames and condemnation for your loyalty to your preacher instead of to God’s Word and the teachings of Christ.

At best, you would have to sift through every single thing your preacher has said, or says from now on, to separate the truth if any, from fiction. If you have to spend all that time stepping through the minefield of his lies; sorting it out and unlearning all the false aspects of the sermon, you might as well not even listen to begin with. Just find a sunny spot at home, read scripture, and let the Holy Spirit teach you directly rather than have the light of God’s Word filtered and corrupted through the bushel basket of a preacher’s biased opinions and motives. Hebrews 3:15

Afterwards, you could fellowship with others who have done the same and compare notes. If you approach this process with humility and a sincere willingness to accept the truth as you find it, it will come to you sooner or later. Certainly more so than by remaining in the complacency factories known as church organizations.
John 14:16-17 “And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; Even the Spirit of truth; whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him: but ye know him; for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you.”

Good luck with receiving that promise, if you are supporting and submitting to a preacher of the world who has scorned and hidden the truth.

Matt 18:16-17 “But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established.

And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.”

Even if that preacher has an occasional valid teaching or advice (which many do), you can not take it to heart anyway. If he says something about loving God’s Law, it does not matter. If he tugs at your heart with an exhortation of faith, you have to take it with a grain of salt, because it is all a show; a paid performance. You will never know if he is sincere or not because first off, he is paid to be there. Technically, the minute anyone makes a financial gain by preaching, he begins working for himself, and ceases to be a workman for God, if he ever was so to begin with.

Secondly, once he has been established as a willful deceiver on this tithe business, he can never be trusted about anything - anything. I do not think Jesus could have been more clear on this point, since He basically identified people like this as being no better than government agents (publicans).

A Full Refund if not Completely Satisfied

Therefore you pay him what he’s worth: nothing; no tithe, no offerings, no book or cd donations - you do not even pay him your attention. Demand a refund of all the tithe money they have fraudulently taken from you, plus the penalties authorized in Leviticus 5:15 and or Exodus 22:1.

As the ads say: “You may be entitled to financial compensation”

2John 11: “If any one cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, [an accurate representation of Christ’s teachings] receive him not into your house, and give him no greeting: for he that giveth him greeting partaketh in his evil works.”
So, let us follow the facts: We know the tithe is invalid for today; we know the evidence for this is so overwhelming that anyone promoting a tithe (particularly after being informed of the facts of the matter) is committing a fraud through the use of a false doctrine; we know that according to this scripture we should shun such people.

Knowing what you now know, if you so much as offer greetings to the tithe promoters, let alone contribute money to them under any pretext, you are rewarding and thus participating in their unrighteousness. It is entirely your choice, but be aware of the consequences if you choose to do so.

What about the other preachers who are sincere and who do change their ways after being corrected? What if you have a wonderful preacher with great sermons? How should he be financially compensated?

Whether highly skilled or mediocre, the payment for a sincere preacher is to provide necessities and to cover basic expenses. It seems harsh in this materialistic world of ours, but what can I say? Which came first - a materialistic Christianity, or materialistic preachers that made it so? Non-materialism is the rule laid down by the Master.

The Santa Clause Effect:
Christmas All Year 'Round

The world order is a hostile environment for God's People. We have an establishment developed to exploit us to our own detriment - a banking system that defrauds both depositors and borrowers; media propaganda that lies and distracts; a government of countless taxes and regulations that are much to our detriment; a deadly medical establishment that kills and maims many tens of thousands of people per year, even as it persecutes bona-fide healers; a predatory legal system/prison industry that defies justice - the list goes on.

The last place we need a hidden adversary holding a Shechita knife behind his back, is within the sanctuary of our congregations of people looking for spiritual

"We hear a lot about wolves in sheep's clothing, however the real danger is The wolves in shepherd's clothing."
growth. We hear a lot about wolves in sheep's clothing, however the real danger is the wolves in shepherd's clothing.

In a materialistic world it is hard enough to raise a family in a spiritualistic, scriptural manner. Faith and knowledge can protect us from outside attacks, and these attacks often have the effect of strengthening faith and solidarity among the brethren. By far the worse threat to Christian parents is to have the faith of our children sabotaged from inside the Christian community by preachers and others who, one after the other, after the other, turn out to be a hypocrite, hireling, liar and/or fraud, or a common weirdo with emotional issues.

If we teach our children that there is a Santa Clause or Easter Bunny, then we deserve their doubt of our integrity and honesty when they find out that our lies about these two characters are just that – lies. The logical reaction then becomes “What else have they told me that is not true? Is the Bible just another fairy tale that they've been telling me about?"

Most people that I associate with have more sense than to intentionally betray their children's trust with nonsense stories like that. But that trust can be unintentionally compromised just as easily, with practically the same damaging results. This is the risk and responsibility that parents take when they submit to a preacher and do not critically examine every single teaching that those children are exposed to; either from the preacher directly, or from the preacher to the parents, who then relate it to the children.

Another way that God-robbing preachers steal from you, is by robbing you of your own children's respect when they find out that this tithe business you have been teaching them is a fraud just like the Santa Clause story. But where Santa brought presents, at least, this tithe business has a malevolent air to it because it defrauded them of what they have worked for, and these younger people often have a keener sense of injustice than we give them credit for.

So, while most doctrines have at least a minimally plausible explanation, the tithe doctrine has none. So when the children ask you about it, how are you going to explain to them why you support a false doctrine that has no Biblical or rational justification whatsoever? Are you going to step up to the plate and admit that you were duped by a preacher that you trusted, and made to look foolish in front of your children? Or are you going to make things worse by somehow justifying and covering for the lies your preacher told?
Stewardship

There are many books, guides, and other programs aimed at improving a Christian’s financial status or prosperity level. It seems like no matter what else is advised along the lines of money management, investing, debt, or other aspects of daily life, tithing always seems to be one of the focus points of the plan.

The writers of these plans often appear to be well-intentioned people who are willing to offer their knowledge to others less informed. However, as we have seen in this book, promoting a tithe is one of the pinnacles of either folly or deception.

True, giving away money or goods is good for the soul as James pointed out, but that is where the road forks to the right with God-instructed righteous giving, and to the left with simply being scammed out of your money by an illegitimate tithe.

Perhaps God gives an “A” for effort and intent to those who have tithed under the delusion that they are “giving to God” but scriptures readily come to mind of those who suffered for what they did; not what they meant to do. Saul, Moses, and the man who tried to save the Ark from falling, are a few such cases for starters.

Responsibly stewarding the wealth that God has allowed you to have is not a concept that many would argue against. Likewise, giving is almost universally accepted in Western and even some Eastern cultures as being beneficial to the giver, so it is basically a no-brainer as well.

The stewardship argument in favor of tithing commits the same error as most of the rest of the pro-tithe camp. They totally mis-identify who the rightful recipients are supposed to be for all of this well-intentioned Christian giving.

It is like sending money or food intended to feed the starving African children, but then having it taken en route by the very dictators who are causing these people to starve. Did the generous givers accomplish anything regarding the starvation? Certainly – they made it even worse for the children by feeding their oppressors.
This is an accurate analogy to Christians who intend to generously give to God but have their gift stolen en route by the religious establishment that is the very cause of many of the problems.

In both cases the error could have been avoided by the giver exercising a bit of due diligence in researching exactly where this money is supposed to go, and where it actually ends up. Failure to do so is an example of slothful stewardship, not good stewardship.

A Review and Conclusion

In order to support the idea that a 10% mandatory tithe of money is required of Christians today, you would have to make several huge leaps of faith and logic. All three of which must be successfully accomplished in order for the modern tithe to be valid:

1: You would have to believe that the tithe is part of God's Eternal Law by assuming that any type of offering, gift, penalty for sin, or sacrifice as described in the Mosaic Law was a "tithe".

You would have to believe that the pre-Mosaic Old Covenant scriptures (Cain, Abraham, and Jacob) cited by preachers using this assumption, are valid proof of a pre-Mosaic tithe that was the same as the Mosaic tithe. As we've seen, those scriptures prove nothing of the sort.

2: You would have to make the mental leap that tithe is anything other than food items, (or derived directly from the sale or redemption of food items) as The Law clearly stipulated it must be. Concurrent with that notion goes the modern era meme that the tithe was levied on any and all labor or income other than agricultural. The Old Covenant Law clearly indicates this is not so, and pro-tither's exceptionally weak arguments provide no Law-changing evidence.
3: You would have to make the huge mental leap that anyone who claims the title of "pastor", "preacher", or "reverend", etc. has inherited the very special, jealously guarded, and God-ordained right of accepting tithe, which was appointed exclusively to the Tribe of Levi.

What we are actually seeing and often participating in today is a tradition in which anyone with enough speaking ability to talk you out of your money while making you believe you are giving it "to God", deserves to keep that money. It is an example of Darwin's law in action.

In light of the fact that it is the pro tithe preachers who are defying and trying to change God's clearly written Law, the burden of proof is upon them to provide a good reason for this change. They repeatedly fail to provide credible evidence to back up their claim to "Levitehood" or any other excuse for tithe-taking.

Along with the "three mental leaps" that have to be made and justified before a serious tithe debate can even begin, there are other foundational factual roadblocks to the acceptance of a modern tithe.

We have seen scriptural proof that both Old and New Covenants define giving to God. This definition does not include giving to a church or preacher, unless he is poor, or if it is a church fund that is designated solely for the help of the needy.

You currently must make the very optimistic, perhaps even naive or irresponsible assumption that whatever is given to your preacher is actually going to do God's work.

You will never know where that money goes, because the preachers often do not want you to know. Some have said flat out that it is none of your business. They have certainly never told you about Paul's example of accountability for gifts given to a ministry.

As if the overwhelming facts of scripture were not enough, it has been the preacher's own behavior: their response to information such as that which is provided in this book, that truly tells the story of the tithe doctrine. The
evasive, generalized answers, the personal attacks against those who go off the reservation by presenting hard questions, the twisting of scripture, and the bizarre practice of blatant outright fabrication of what they say scripture says, when it is plain to see that those scriptures say nothing of the sort. (See Appendix B, "Twenty-Five Rules of Disinformation")

When the support of a doctrine consists of a pattern of biased and falsely represented information that no fully informed reasonable person would likely consider for more than a minute, let alone believe, you know it is time to implement 1 Corinthians 6:5 “I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren?”

This concept lines up with 3 John 1:9-11, where John identifies a church leader as being evil.

So though we are expected to cut each other some slack due to our imperfections, there comes a time when we need to commit the unpopular act of calling a spade a spade, a lie a lie, and evil, evil. The fact that frauds are so commonplace, even among our own circle of acquaintances, is no excuse to shy away from the impolite act of identifying them. Instead it is a call to start cleaning house as to who you associate with, and who has an influence on your life and character.

I hate to have an accusatory tone throughout this book, but if the pro-tithe faction wants to promote a belief or doctrine, particularly one that benefits themselves at the expense of others, they really should have a plausible, readily understood, yea even iron-clad defense for that position based on clearly worded scripture before accepting money in God’s name and under false pretexts.

The facts indicate that the pro-tithers do not; they are nowhere even close. Instead they are more accurately described by Jude 1:11 “Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain, and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and perished in the gainsaying of Core.”

Like Cain, the priority of some preachers is worldliness, and like Balaam (who was actually a bona-fide prophet of God), the preachers who could have been true men of God, have instead sold out for the money and comforts of the world.
Chapter 30
Outroduction

Original Research and Compilation

This book represents several years of part-time research, writing, and editing. I have had no input from any anti-tithe articles, books, or audio/visual presentations, because my intention was to not merely rehash the conclusions of others, but to let the facts of scripture lead to their own conclusions.

I limited myself to a collection of Bible translations, and associated general reference works like encyclopedias, dictionaries, Josephus, and Strong's Concordance. I simply read scripture and researched as the questions occurred to me. I made these findings, and came to the conclusions that I have presented, because of the fact that I did not listen to, or seek the opinions of others. This book comes out against the entrenched, popular teaching of the tithe doctrine, because that is where the facts have led me.

Several multi-disc cd presentations, cassette tape sermons and newsletter articles of pro-tithe propaganda provided the main source of subject matter. I
of course realize that there are countless other pro-tithe presentations floating about, but that does not matter.

When preachers are confronted with facts about the tithe they generally do three things: They first try to dismiss any dissent with the usual Malachi "God-robber" comments or other sound bites, hoping that the questions will then just go away. Secondly, they may actually go to the scriptures to try to find support for their tithe doctrine. When that fails, they will invariably turn to each other for doctrinal support.

In other words, I do not have to seek out every pro-tithe book or audio presentation because the current pro-tithe preachers have already done that for me. As stated in the section called "Pro-tithe Technique", they have a definite pattern of how they perpetuate this myth that they simply repeat. Rehashing and recycling previously presented tithe myths; they use the same techniques and limited repertoire of disproven angles, sound bites, human rationalizations, and misrepresented scriptures over and over again. So once you have heard a few of these presentations, you have basically heard them all, because there are only a few limited ways for them to skin this cat, and once you know the truth, you can identify and disprove every one of them.

As I said earlier, an anti-tither is up against centuries of accumulated, effective, crowd-controlling pro-tithe propaganda technique, but that does not mean that the pro-tithe doctrine is not a house of cards that can easily be brought down.

When the door was opened to investigate the tithe doctrine, who would have known what a virtual disaster area of scriptural malfeasance I was walking into. There was not a step that could be taken without encountering quasi-scriptural non-facts that needed cleaning up, straightening out, or discarding. Just as it is with a real disaster, the damage was so great and destruction of scriptural intent so obvious, that it did not take an expert to start picking up debris and putting things back in order. Thus I started to put things together, one thing led to another, and we ended up with this book that could easily have been double its current size.

While I believe the anti-tithe position presented here is conclusive, more or less complete, and of benefit to all who read it; I am not so vain so as to think
that everyone who reads it will accept my position on the subject; some people just plain will not do so, no matter what is said, and some people can not accept it because they are not meant to. Some things are just out of our hands.

There is a saying that goes something to the effect of: “You can't convince a man of something when his income depends on him not knowing it.”

Second Peter 2:2-3 "And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.

And through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you: whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not."

Misguided tithing by Christians has been going on for over fifteen hundred years, and this book certainly can not be the first effort to have discovered the scriptural facts that prove the illegitimacy of that practice.

If others have written about it as well as, or better than I, and yet the tithe still exists, pro-tithers take heart: There's a tither born every minute and your cash inflow will no doubt continue to keep the business model intact and profitable. Of course, in this day and age, there certainly is a chance that readers will make this truth go viral, and with your help Christianity will finally be free of this parasitic fraud known as modern day tithing.

My satisfaction comes from those who found this effort to be well worth the time to read; those whose lives have been bettered, burdens (of tithing) lifted, thoughts provoked and scriptural interests renewed by this information, and those who get that certain little charge in life when they discover a new truth.

This would also include readers who have enjoyed the snippets of humor and metaphoric application, as well as the homeschoolers who have enlarged their vocabulary or have received other such salubrious results from these pages.

Of course my real reward for this work comes in seeing how the Christian community as a whole can benefit from a realization of scriptural facts that were once suppressed. The productive Christians as well as the needy benefit both physically and spiritually in a true paradigm of Christian generosity that is now one step closer to freeing itself of the same problem that Paul and Peter had in their day: hireling, false preachers and commercialized churches.
Jesus and God’s Word cannot really be the Rock upon which many of these church businesses are built, because we have seen many of the basic scriptures that have been ignored, perverted or totally re-invented by these people; thus invoking what amounts to the preaching of “another Jesus”.

This is all made possible by lies; particularly because of the big lie: the concept of a paid, prosperous, professional preacher. One of the lynch-pins that makes the big lie profitable is the myth of the tithe.

Suffice it to say: stop feeding the wolves; they are big enough already. Instead use your money to help yourself, your family, your brethren, and especially the poor. With the way things are going, I think that you will be seeing a lot more of them in the years to come.