

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O-pcjHD9BJM>

Solomon's Gold Series - Part 11: We Three Kings Wise Men Ophir, Sheba, Seba, Tarshish

July 2, 2017 Length: 1 hour, 34 minutes, 59 seconds

Ever wonder who wrote "We Three Kings" and why he identified them as from the Orient? as kings? as 3? That's not in the bible, right? Actually, we will take you on a journey from the East from which these wise "kings" came, yes the bible says, kings. The Bible specifically identifies these areas and we will show you as well as the origin of the accepted traditional story. Where it leads will blow your mind. The Bible interprets the bible and we will show how this story has gotten so mixed up by so many scholars for so many years. Is it possible the wise kings who brought presents after Jesus' birth came from the ancient land of Ophir, Tarshish, and Sheba which we have proven is the Philippines? You shall see.

Don't forget to subscribe to our YouTube Channel as there are even more Solomon's Gold Series videos on the way as we continue to uncover information especially from the interaction from our viewers. Always remember to prove all things for yourself.

Key Moments

2:12 We Three Kings of Orient
9:14 Names of the Three Wise Men
16:38 The King of Persia
17:11 Balthazar
22:08 Origin of the Story
35:03 The Seven Stars
54:46 Matthew 2
1:00:13 The Gold of Sheba
1:18:22 7 All the Flocks of Kedar

Transcript:

Welcome to the God Culture where we urge you to challenge tradition as first Thessalonians 5:21 tells us "prove all things, hold fast that which is good" We do not intend to be confrontational but to compare what the Bible really says versus the traditions of men which Jesus himself

rebuked. Jesus said to the Pharisees, "Full well ye reject the Commandment of God that ye may keep your own tradition." Mark 7:9.

No, we are not done with Solomon's Gold Series yet. This topic is one we could not ignore and it's ramifications are huge. You have probably heard the song "We Three Kings of Orient Are," right? Okay. Referring to the wise men or "kings" or, we hear all the time "Magi," who brought gifts to Yahusha, Jesus, after his birth. Did you ever wonder where he got the term "Orient" in this song? Because it doesn't seem to match what scholars are telling us today. The Bible says they were from the East, but it does not really tell us more, does it? And the term "Magi." Why do we hear some scholars and tradition so often using this term? The Greek word is actually "magos." Don't know if we're pronouncing it correctly, but its spelling is m-a-g-o-s -- used in the Bible, not Magi. Is someone trying to send us on the wrong trail here? We will prove in this video that, not only does the passage and description of these kings and, yes, if scholars would read the Bible, they would stop writing articles saying they weren't actually really kings, because we are going to show you a scripture that is going to pull all of this together. And yes, they were kings and it ties to our search for Solomon's gold in a wonderful way. Correcting this, however, we warn you, will set off a spiral in your thinking. Because you will realize why this is being covered up -- not just misunderstood -- but indisputably covered up. And once again, this leads back to the ancient land of incredible significance -- the Philippines, the land of Ophir, Sheba, and Tarshish where Solomon got his gold and resources. See if you agree by the end of this video. But first let's listen to the first verse of the Beach Boys' version of We Three Kings: [Music malfunctioned on the video.]

Ever wonder who wrote that Christmas Carol so long ago? Why did he say "Orient" and why "kings," instead of "wise men"? And why "three"? Did he not know the Bible does not specify the number of wise men nor does the passage in Matthew, which we will review, mention "kings"? Who was this guy? His name John Henry Hopkins, Jr. And he lived in the 1800s. Turns out he was son of a first or second Bishop of Vermont -- depends on what source you review. He was very deeply entrenched in theology and he wrote music, as well. As a songwriter I know that your theology will come out in your songs. So here, again, are the words to We Three Kings written by Hopkins in 1857:

"We Three Kings of Orient Are
bearing gifts we traverse afar
field and fountain, moor and mountain
following yonder star."

You say, "this is but a small thing." But is there more to this story?

Let's look at another song Hopkins wrote in the 1800s which further exposes his thinking. And look, he expounds theologically in a direction no one would have expected. On your right is an actual song sheet for another song he wrote, titled "When from the East the wise men came."

Here are the words:

Led by the Star of Bethlehem,
the gifts they brought to Jesus were
of gold and frankincense and myrrh."

Makes sense so far. Pretty much matches the other song -- nothing new, right? Until you get to verse two:

"Bright gold of Ophir, [wow!] passing fine,
proclaims a King of royal line;

What words! Where did this come from? Wait! Gold of Ophir? Matthew doesn't say that. No, it does not, but we have found the scripture that does, and we'll get there. He is saying the gold presented after Yahushua's birth (Jesus) which later in the song he calls an offering on the altar, by the way, came from Ophir. Why? Because Hopkins viewed Solomon's Gold Series, right? No. Because he knew the Bible and history. We are not bringing up anything new. This isn't new doctrine. We're finding things that were already there and pulling them together. That's all we're doing. And we're not the first to do this, by the way. Notice the "gold of Ophir, passing fine" in the words of this song -- also a description in passages we read earlier in this series of the gold of Ophir. It's "fine gold" -- "proclaims a King of royal line." Doesn't that mean, hmm, like King Solomon? Oh, yes. and is this not similar to the Queen of Sheba story? We'll get there, too. How did he know it was in the Orient though? We will cover this, too. If you know the Bible and what the words

actually say, that is what the Bible says. However, one thing added to his song long after he passed were the names of the three wise men, which he never put in there. We've reviewed the words of what he wrote and he never identified their names and neither does the Bible. So that's kind of odd, because these names keep coming up and even scholars support this. But did you ever wonder where they came from?

So this is what tradition tells us. This is from catholiceducation.org:

"Casper, Melchior and Balthasar --

Since the seventh Century in the western church the Magi [Don't scholars know the Greek word is "magos", not Magi? Hmm.] have been identified as Casper, Melchior, and Balthasar. [Really? By who?] A work called the Excerpta et Collectanea [However you say that] attributed to Saint Bede [or Bidet however you say that] in 735 A.D wrote "The Magi were the ones who gave gifts to the Lord. The first is said to have been Melchior, an old man with white hair and a long beard... [Wow! he's got great detail] who offered gold to the Lord as to a king. [and] The second, Casper by name, young and beardless in ruddy complexioned [we know ruddy means dark-skinned, not black necessarily, although it could be] ... honored him as God by his gift of incense, an oblation worthy of divinity. The third, black-skinned and heavily bearded, named Baltasar... by his gift of myrrh testified to the Son of Man who was to die."

These are the exact words from catholiceducation.org. Go look it up yourself. They're not our words. So where did this come from? They have been identified. Really? Don't tell me we are looking at another occult -- a goat-lady context once again. Well, let's give them the benefit of the doubt here and finish reading this excerpt.

"An excerpt from a medieval saints calendar printed in Cologne read, 'Having undergone many trials and fatigues for the Gospel, the three wise men met at Sewa (Sebaste in Armenia) in A.D. 54 [Really?] to celebrate the feast of Christmas. [Hmm. better check our history on that one. Did Christmas exist in A.D. 54? We'll check] Thereupon after the celebration of mass, they died: St. Melchior on January 1st, aged 116; St. Baltasar on January 6th [so just five days apart] aged 112; and St. Casper [another five days later] on January 11th, at age 109.' [Wow! they were old.] The Roman Martyrology also lists these dates as the Magi's respective feast days.

Oh, so they have feast days. They were sainted and they knew their names. Hmm. So let us be clear: the Feast of Christmas did not exist in A.D. 54. That is a fairy tale. There was no festival called Christmas at that time in history and the disciples who followed Yahusha (Jesus) never celebrated Christmas that. Didn't happen. There's no mention of that in any of their writings and it would have been because that would have been a very, very large thing. We'll talk about that in another series at a later date.

The only feast similar on the same date celebrating the birth of a god -- not Yahusha (Jesus), mind you, was called Saturnalia in Rome. It was a very pagan festival. They all celebrated it and died at the same time, according to this excerpt and somehow they were sainted. But how does this happen? Because we have yet to see any proof they even existed and that their names are even correct, nor that there were only three of them, because the Bible does not say any of this, which we will review. But let's dig a little deeper into this history and into their names specifically.

Search Google for "Caspar" and Wikipedia brings up Gondophares, not Caspar. But obviously there's a connection there, right? So

"Gondophares I (one) was the founder of the Indo-Parthian Kingdom in what is now Afghanistan and Pakistan. Gondophares was translated in Armenian in 'Gastaphar,' and then in Western languages into "Gaspar" [okay, that's not Caspar, but okay, let's give them the benefit of the doubt.] He may be the 'Gaspar, King of Persia.' [So now he's the King of Persia, yeah. It confuses us. But] Caspar [also, according to Wikipedia,] brought gold."

Now on the flip side of his coin, because there's actually some history to go along with this, which we show you to the right, is his god, Zeus. Perhaps he may have thought to replace this with Yahusha (Jesus) since he traveled for two years -- that's right, he must have gotten lost at least 12 times on his journey because Persia is not a two-year journey from Jerusalem or Bethlehem, really. Okay. Or maybe he didn't think it so important, perhaps. And just kind of waited and then eventually left. Ehh. Probably not. Really scholars don't ask these simple questions before propagating these false narratives, because this is false -- absolutely

false and we're going to continue to prove this. So, either this is the wrong guy, and it is, with the wrong name, and it is, which is really stretching it as an interpretation, anyway, or the Bible is wrong, which it's not. Wait till you see the scripture that tells you where these men came from, by the way, and it will blow your mind.

But let's look at the other two kings first.

"Melchior -- He was traditionally called the King of Persia [so now we have two different Kings of Persia at the same time? Doesn't make sense, but okay. Let's play along.] and brought the gift of gold to Jesus. Wait! Didn't the other guy bring gold and was King of Persia? Okay, maybe we're a little confused. We'll keep reading.] In the Western Christian Church he is regarded as a saint [Really? a saint? How does that happen?] (as are the other two Magi). [Okay]

"Balthazar -- Balthazar is traditionally referred to as the King of Arabia [at least he was a different country] and gave the gift of myrrh to Jesus. In the Western Christian Church, he is also regarded as a saint (as are the other two magi).

Note: Wikipedia seems to be confused because there are three gifts but two of these guys came with gold. So there's really only two gifts. But who knows? And are there even three? Whew. You would think that they would know better and this was edited by a Catholic source. So, maybe they were just confused. So here we have it. The three kings came from Persia, India, Persia and Arabia, right? Notice any proof from these sources? Uh, no. None. But what is all this based on? Because the Bible does not name the three wise men nor the countries they came from, right? Well, actually we're going to show you something that's going to blow the doors off of that.

Even Wikipedia notes in these passages:

"The gospels of the New Testament in the Bible do not give the names of the Magi (or even how many there were,) but their traditional names are ascribed to a Greek manuscript [... ah, the source] from 500 A.D translated into Latin [of course. So no one could read it] and commonly accepted as the source of the names.

Okay. There you go. That's the source. So we located a source which explains this. Now let's find this source or at least something that can explain what it is and where it came from.

Here's a very learned scholar and in his book "New Testament studies blah blah blah" [You see it on the screen.] volume 10, Bruce M. Metzger PHD, DD, LHD, D (Doctorate) of Theology, Professor of New Testament Language and Literature at Princeton Theological Seminary and Fellow of the British Academy in 1980, writes:

"The original text of the chronicle [meaning the three kings] was Greek; it was drawn up by an Alexandrian Christian, who lived, it seems, [hmm] in the sixth century. Concerning the Magi the unknown chronicler writes... 'the names of the three kings were... Balthasar, Melchior, and Gaspar.'"

There you have it. So let's all scrap the actual Bible story and follow an anonymous Christian from Alexandria, of all places, which had Christians but was also very heavily infiltrated by gnostic occultists claiming to be Christians. And let's see, he may have lived in the 6th century, or well, he lived anyway at some time, right? There are the three names. Would you judge this piece of information as credible? I mean, come on. The same scholars disinclude entire books of the prophets from the Bible Canon because they cannot prove authorship and this is proof of authorship? Really? And you're going to take this and run with it? And then create this whole myth that we're supposed to believe... that, does what? Covers up history. In this case they throw that out -- all of that, you know. The standard -- this is how we decide what is truly something that should be considered Canon and scripture, that we should follow. They throw all of that out -- completely out of the window, and accept what is clearly a misleading writing from clearly a gnostic to anyone who reads it. No detail. No backup information. Nothing. Who was this guy? Come on. You know better. Okay. Enough of this junk history. Let's go back to the real true source of the story and the truth of the Bible.

The origin of the story actually comes from Matthew chapter two. So let's read:

"Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, Saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his

star in the east and our come to worship Him. When Herod the king had heard these things, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him. And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born."

Does it say three kings? No. Could it be three? Actually we'll prove, no, but we will show you why we believe the number three ends up in the song, "We Three Kings", and we'll show you there were more as laid out by the Bible, itself. So Herod demands to know when Yahusha (Jesus) was born because they saw the star in the east where they came from. No, the star was not in the East Sky, as we've heard in many sermons because then they would have followed it further east, because later it says they followed the star. It was in the Western sky and it was not stationary, either, as you will see. Special note: if the priest, the chief priests and scribes were aware that the Messiah had been born, or even if it were speculated, wouldn't one think they would have journeyed with the wise men just to take a peek? Because as Yahusha (Jesus) tells us in Mark 7:9, they are following their own traditions at this point. Which we can now see laid out in the Talmud, which is just the written version of the oral tradition that Yahusha (Jesus) was referring to. It in no way complements the Torah, by the way. It is not the Bible. It is not the Torah, but instead sets out to re-interpret it in a mystical occult way. And completely changes the meanings of practically everything, including the Messiah. This is why they were not looking for Messiah, because they had given up on Him by that point. And they were not going to believe anything anyone said on the matter because their oral traditions, later called the Talmud, discounted the possibility and reinterpreted even prophecy. And in fact, they even banned books like Isaiah who mentions the Messiah. So, no, they were already anti-Messiah in religion and Judaism which still is to this day.

So they came from the East which is the Greek word "anatole."
Remember in Solomon's Gold Series we illustrate for you that the Hebrew word used for "east" in Genesis is the word for "Orient." Could this also be the case here? Yes, even though Strong's Concordance somehow missed this and that's a major miss, in our opinion. A quick search on Google translate even renders the Greek word for "Orient" as the same word "anatole". Interesting. For those Filipinos watching the phrase "from the east" is actually translated in Greek as "apo anatole" or

apo orient." Coincidence? Wait till you see where we are going in Scripture.

But let's continue the story. So let's look at this word "Magi" everyone talks about. It's all you hear around Christmas time in regards to the story in many churches. Magi sounds more like magician, doesn't it? And that's exactly what tradition tells us these men were. But let's look at the full definition and the actual word because the word is not "Magi." No, no. This is Greek and the word is "magos." Someone is going to try to say they are the same word, but this was written in Greek and the word used is "magos," not "Magi." It's just not there. Sorry. Strong's Concordance says "a Magian" [sounds like magician, right?] i.e. an (Oriental) astrologer, by implication [we hate it when they imply] a magician."

Hmm. So, not only could the word "east" actually directly mean "orient", by the way, but the actual word "magos" also means "Orient". Hmm. That's quite a coincidence, wouldn't you say? That's what it says. But what about this phrase "by implication, a magician"? We don't have to imply such, because we do not believe they were. That's an occult mentality to assume such. An astrologer. Hmm. Where do they get astrologer? Because they watch the stars. That doesn't mean they were astrologers. Well, that sounds bad, too, right? But in this same sense Adam, Enoch, Noah, they were all astrologers. No, not astrologers as we say today. They weren't looking for their horoscopes. No, but they watched the stars. They studied the patterns of the stars, the sun and the moon and that is well recorded. You see how things get so twisted by tradition? How is it that the King James translators came up with wise men and that isn't even one of their definitions here. Well, let's look a little further because Strong's Exhaustive Concordance says,

"a Magian, i.e. Oriental scientist; by implication, a magician -- sorcerer, wise man."

Now finally. So now we have Oriental, no longer in parentheses, by the way, scientist. Now that's more like it. What is a scientist? Well, as we defined science earlier in the series. Science is by observation and experiment. So scientists observe and experiment. So they observe the stars -- not set up astrological constellations, especially not ones named after false gods. Come on. Adam didn't do that. That didn't come from any of his lineage not on the good side, anyway. On the Cain side, oh,

yeah, and we'll get into that in the Flood Series more. But how can we be so confident that these things are wrongly interpreted? Because, as we have said before, we interpret the Bible with the Bible and we're going to show you scripture that clarifies all of this. And we'll get there and you just wait. But first, let's finish this story because we don't want to cut out in the middle.

Matthew 2:5-7

"And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judaea: for thus it is written by the prophet, [this, by the way, is a direct quote from Micah 5:2 for anyone that wishes to know] And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel. Then Herod, when he had privily called the wise men (magos, again), enquired of them diligently what time the star appeared."

So, again, the chief priests and the scribes knew where Messiah would be born but they did not believe it, because they were not looking for Messiah. Because they actually were a part of a completely different religion at that point. Why did Herod want to know when the star first appeared? Well, to determine the age of this king so he could kill him. Yes, and you'll see that later in scripture. But this says they knew when it appeared because they were watching for it. Why would they be watching for the sign of the Messiah? Because they were followers of the Old Testament writings, not occultists and pagans. They knew who Yahuah, Abba, was and we're even going to cover in another video who Batala [?] was. But we'll save that for later,

Matthew 2:8-10

And he sent them to Bethlehem and said. Go and search diligently for the young child; and when ye have found him, bring me word again, that I may come and worship him also."

Oh, that clever Herod. Come and worship him, too? Doesn't that sound exactly like Satan? This is how he operates -- through infiltration -- coming as the angel of Light and deception, not by cramming Satanism down your throat. Let's keep reading"

"When they had heard the king, they departed; and, lo, the star, which they saw in the east, went before them, [it moved], till it came and stood over where the child was."

Hold it! Hold it! Hold it! You mean, the star moved in the sky? It wasn't fixed? How could that be? See, there are some trying to use Solarium software, or whatever it's called, to pinpoint the exact time and date of Yahusha (Jesus') birth and it's very compelling. That will never work, however, because this star moved just like the pillar of Fire by Night followed by the Israelites in the wilderness. It's not a fixed star. You're not going to find it on star charts. No. Back to the story.

"When they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy."

You mean, because they were sorcerers who were occultists, pagans, who wanted to learn more magic from Jesus? Of course not. That's all nonsense. They weren't even Magi they were "magos" -- Oriental scientists. So let's look at the word for "star" a little deeper and see if we can get more meaning out of this passage. The Greek word used here is "aster" which simply means "a star" but it also shows up in Yahusha (Jesus') reference in Revelation 1:20. So let's look at that.

"The mystery of the seven stars which thou sawest in my right hand, and the seven golden candlesticks. The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches: "

So in this case in Revelation, "star" means "angel." We believe the same of this verse:

The star appeared in the orient and traveled [like an angel] all the way to Israel over a two-year period, by the way, which we'll show you, ahead of the kings. They were following the star. It says it advanced. And yep, we said kings, and we'll show you in just a bit. Even the Old Testament says the star will advance. In numbers 24:17 it says, "I see him [this is a prophecy of Messiah]... I see him, though not now. I behold Him, though not near. A star shall advance from Jacob and a staff shall rise from Israel. Once again the star advances. It moves.

Matthew 2:11-12

"And when they were come into the house, they saw the young child with Mary his mother and fell down and worshiped him:"

Wait! This is why they came? -- to worship him? Yes, that's what it says. They came to worship him. So were they sorcerers? Were they occultists? No way. Not on your life. No way. That is an occult mentality and we reject it completely. And notice -- and this is big -- this is huge -- They did not worship Joseph. Nope. Nope and they did not worship Mary, either. Nor did they pray to Mary. Since Jesus was only two years old and certainly couldn't answer their prayers yet, right? Well, he also hadn't died and resurrected and ascended to Heaven again. But that's a whole nother point. And if Mary were divine, don't you think this would be a good place for the Bible to mention it? Ehh, Yeah. But it doesn't. And don't you think at that point they would have turned around and worshiped her, too, right? That didn't happen, did it? No, this is another example of how Mary is not divine and she is not to be worshiped nor prayed to. Sorry. That is a fact biblically. And anything outside of the Bible we have no interest in. So that's where we're coming from. You don't have to agree but that's what the Bible says. Let's go back to the story.

"and when they had opened their treasures, they presented unto him gifts; gold, and frankincense and myrrh."

Oh, boy. Oh, frankincense and myrrh. Well, they only come from one place in the world, you know. They must come from Ethiopia and Yemen, right? So, so that just disproves this whole story. There's no way that what we're saying could be true. Somehow in all of this journey for Solomon's gold, we continue to run into Ethiopia and Yemen, trying to take credit for the Philippines. How about that? Is there a reason for that? Maybe. We'll talk about that. In fact, we will. We are going to talk about all three of these gifts and the Bible is also going to clarify this itself. And it will blow all of this occult mentality out of the water.

"And being warned of God in a dream that they should not return to Herod, they departed into their own country another way."

Okay. Wait a minute. Everyone knows that frankincense only comes from Ethiopia and myrrh only comes from Arabia, right? Wrong! Wrong on the word and wrong on the usage of the word in our opinion. And oh, we are going to prove this. We all know gold comes from Ophir, Sheba, and

Tarshish, so we don't need to debate this. And if you're not sure about that, go back and view the rest of the series and we just indisputably prove that. That is the case. It was being mined since Solomon's era in a thousand BC in the Philippines. But frankincense means these kings came from Ethiopia, right? Wrong. Here's the word -- the Greek word used here is "libanos" which originates from the Hebrew word "lebownah" which could mean frankincense, perhaps, or incense. But we're going to dig into that much deeper. You're gonna like this. We have a major issue with the usage of the word frankincense in antiquity because of its origin. You see another coincidence, according to one of our viewers; Josephine Delgado, "libanos" is also a Tagalog word referring to horseradish. Now we are not saying the kings brought horseradish to the birth of Messiah so don't, don't -- please don't send us a comment about that, because we didn't say that. We're not saying that. No, they did not bring horseradish. Please! But what a coincidence that there is yet another linguistic tie to the Philippines -- to Tagalog -- and Hebrew, regardless of what the definition is. Just thought we would mention that and make a note. That's all.

So digging a little deeper there are two parts to the word Frank incense the word -- "frank" which is old French and "encens" which is also old French. So two words that are both old French. Here's our challenge to the usage of this word in this translation. The Franks (the French) did not migrate to modern France until the third century A.D and there is no evidence of that language prior to that point whatsoever. And Jesus (Yahusha) was born 300 years before that language even existed, whether alone, somehow migrated to referring to Ethiopian "incense." That would have taken hundreds of years after that. The word "frankincense" was not used at the time of Yahusha's birth and it is very misleading to use it in this passage. It does not belong there. It is disingenuous and it is, I'm sorry, but it is a deception, period. Scholars hop on top of this kind of train and travel into occult land unknowingly perhaps, in some cases. We believe knowingly. This is meant to throw us off the trail, because the Bible tells us exactly where these gifts and wise men came from. And we are going to show you. We're going to get there, I promise. So with all these ties we and others are finding two Hebrew origins in the languages of the Philippines -- we wondered if perhaps the ancient Ophirians may have weighed in on this topic themselves. So let's give it a try.

Oh, boy, oh, boy, oh, boy. Look what we found -- the Tagalog word for frankincense is "chaman" (sorry if we mispronounced it. We probably did.) Could this be a word or a portion thereof of Hebrew origin? We believe so and we found one. "Chaman" in Hebrew is very telling and we will just read a paragraph from a Jewish website describing the definition and application of "chaman."

Slide title: Frankincense: in Tagalog: Kamanyang -- Origin from Hebrew root word: chaman:

Hebrew word is "chaman"... This word has extremely broad usages. This word expresses the idea of wealth or pleasure that is obtained through violence, oppression, theft, etc. [ah, What? Okay. keep reading] It includes predatory lending, ponzi schemes, corrupt businessmen who put others out of business to enhance their own. [Could Ethiopia be doing that a little? Ouch.] Ultimately, it carries out the idea of enhancing your own power, wealth and/or pleasure at the expense of another person. [And we will add or country.] Chaman even involves little things like that subtle difference of asking for a donation from someone and telling them rather than reminding them that God will bless them in a financial way for that donation. [Who does that sound like? (whispered: Catholic Church.)] Anyway, does this sound familiar to you? Are you starting to see this is a deception? Unfortunately, not even a good one, as scholars should have seen this through these years, and we believe Hopkins, the writer of "We Three Kings" did, as well, and so did ancient Filipinos. This does not look like a coincidence to us, even through language the ancestor Ophirians are speaking to us and telling us: this is a corrupt deception of this word meant to enslave you. Others will benefit. They will gain from this deception. To hide your history and attain wealth through violence, if necessary. Go look at who is supporting violent demonstrations in the Philippines today, as well as Isis, for that matter. We're not going to go there, but look it up.

And through oppression. Not that that ever happened in the Philippines, of course, [that's sarcasm] and theft. So where is your family gold and precious stones which was present in practically every household -- even slaves -- according to Pigafetta? Hmm. Who is exploiting your resources as a country even today? The very same captors -- the Jesuits and Holy Roman Empire which conquered your country 400 years ago, tricking you into worshiping idols, disobeying the second commandment,

thus receiving its curse. So much so that some are denying that praying to Mary, whom they identify as divine -- a god -- is not actually worship. Yes, it is. By the way, the "yang" in "kamanyang" could very well refer to the yin and yang. It's not Hebrew. As a way to identify in the same manner, yin is good and yang is evil. There are different interpretations out there but this is the common understanding of that word and boy, does evil apply here. We can hear your ancestors crying out through this word and its translation saying, "so they brought frankincense and myrrh from Ethiopia and Yemen? ah, horseradish!" That's what we hear. However, even if you wish to use these words, like frankincense -- a word that didn't exist in the age in which this was written, which are corrupt -- clearly deceptive translations. Let's take a good look at the Philippines which could still fit the corrupted translation as it has cousins to frankincense and myrrh which have grown native here for thousands of years.

Slide title: Philipping Frankincense: Burseraceae Family (Same as Frankincense)

[The] Gum Elemi (soft): *Canarium commune* from the Philippines. Elemi produces a bright lemony, woody fragrance with a hint of fennel, frankincense and grass. Elemi is a cousin to myrrh and frankincense (*Boswellia carterii*) and is often referred to as "the poor man's frankincense," as it is a bit easier on the pocket.

Oh, well, "Poor Man's frankincense." Now you're stretching it, right? However, here is what we want you to understand. These gifts are all elements of the sacrifice dating all the way back to Adam right after the Garden of Eden from the land of Havillah, which we have already covered is Philippines, which is why it's significant. One may try to make the point that this has to be the best possible or it is discounted and if you have ever burned incense you will likely find there is little difference in frankincense and the Elemi other than the price. Why is frankincense more valuable -- more expensive? Because it's in the Bible disingenuously? No, it's not in the Bible. The word frankincense never appears. Not one time in the Bible, because it didn't exist at the point in which the Bible was written. And again, we showed you, is a far newer word. No one referred to frankincense in Yahusha's time, because the word did not exist yet. Furthermore, what makes these elements special to Yahuwah (God) is not the quality necessarily, although we do not believe there's a major difference. But the significance of these being the

very same incense used by Adam, Enoch, Noah, etc. so they would have to come from the ancient land of Havillah, which is not Ethiopia, but Ophir, Sheba, and Tarshish in the Philippines. But is why Ethiopia has to try to take that mantle because, you see, all of this ties together. If we disprove Ethiopia as Sheba, as we did, if we disprove Ethiopia and Yemen as Ophir, which we did, and Tarshish, which it never even claims because it can't, then we disprove that it could be the elements used in this offering to Yahusha two years after his birth. It's definitely 100 percent. And we're gonna bring this home with a scripture that is going to make this abundantly clear. And it spells it out, but even these so far have spelled it out. They do not say what we've been told all of these years -- not convincing enough. Ah, let's take a further look because that's not the only one.

Here is another possibility from the Philippines that is a cousin to frankincense and myrrh which are all in the same family:

Slide title: Philippine Frankincense: Burseraceae Family (same as Frankincense)

Pili (soft): *Canarium genera*. [It's also known as] *Canarium ovatum*, and *Canarium luzonicum* -- [because of Luzon island, of course,] from the Philippines. [It's a] Cousin to Myrrh and Frankincense.

These are two options. But there are actually several more trees from the same family which bear similar resins from the Philippines that are native. Some are even used by major name brand perfumes today, as well. So their quality is actually high. Well, that's frankincense. But what about myrrh?

Pretty much the same applies, in that there are trees of the same family which we showed you in the Philippines. But here's the Greek word for myrrh. It's "smyrna". It means "myrrh, a bitter gum and costly perfume which exudes from a certain tree or shrub in Arabia and Ethiopia, [of course it has to be a certain one -- only that one, right? Wrong.] or is obtained by incisions made in the bark: as an antiseptic it was used for embalming.

Why do both of these definitions say they must refer to Arabia and Ethiopia only? They can't come from anywhere else in the world? No. Actually no. And we saw the same reasoning in the queen of sheba's

story. It's called circular reasoning. How do you know the Bible word meant "myrrh" because one of the three wise men came from Arabia, right? Well, how do you know the wise man came from Arabia? Well, of course, because he brought myrrh. He did not come from Arabia and we strongly questioned that. The only element fitting this definition could be myrrh and here's why. Dig deeper the word Smyrna originates from the Greek word "myron," which is a much more generic word meaning ointment. Does this seem to smell to you? Not like frankincense or myrrh, by the way, but like something has been manufactured right under our noses all of these years? Yeah. And we will prove it in a minute. But let's finish this story first.

We're going to skip ahead a little because it leaves the wise men and comes back. Here's where it comes back. In Matthew 2:16.

"Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wrath (angry) and sent forth and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem and in all the coasts thereof."

Wow! not just Bethlehem. See, that's what we're always told in the children's story but, no, it was far worse. Also in the lands of the coasts. This guy was really evil -- really evil! And look at the holidays he celebrated and you'll learn something else there, too. But we're not going to go there right now.

"from two years old and under according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men."

Why two years old and under? That's when the wise men said they first saw the star in the east when Yahusha (Jesus) was born. And why did it take two years for the wise men to respond to the most significant birth of all time? Actually this is very simple. Because they did not come from Babylon or Persia, home of the occult and mystery Babylon religion, which is less than one month's journey, nor Ethiopia or Yemen or Arabia, home of the occult Queen of Sheba's story -- where she has goat legs -- which you find earlier in this series. If you haven't heard that, yet, go back and listen and you'll understand what we mean. We didn't say she did. The occult story did -- that scholars, yes, scholars are using all the time. Crazy! -- Which is also about one month's journey. Nor did they come from Yemen which is about the same; nor India which would take just a

few short months. They would have left immediately upon seeing the star and they did. The journey took two years to get there because they came from Ophir, Sheba, and Tarshish and if you saw Part three "Jonah's Journey Corrected", if not, you are missing out, by the way. We offer biblical references that the ships at the Red Sea port were broken up at the time of Jonah and still at this time and they had to leave for Ophir, Tarshish, from the Mediterranean port but still ended up in the Indian Ocean because they went the long way around Africa -- because they had to. The Red Sea port was broken. Same logic here. The Red Sea port was still not functioning and the journey would have been longer than the typical one-year journey from the Philippines to the Red Sea port. It would have been closer to twice as much -- about a two-year journey and that is why it took two years. We know. There we go, again, speculating, right? Well, now it's time to throw this scripture on you. Let's see if perhaps there is an Old Testament prophecy of the birth of Yahusha (Jesus) which actually tells us exactly where these presents came from and where these kings and it says "kings" came from. Here we go.

So now we bring it home. Dispute all else that we said. Don't believe any of it. But believe the Bible because here it is in black and white -- a prophecy of Messiah from King David.

Psalm 72:10-15

"The kings of Tarshish (Philippines) and of the isles [you mean Ophir? exactly (Philippines)] shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba [Where? Philippines] and Seba [we'll explain (Philippines)] shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him. For he shall deliver the needy when he crieth; the poor also, and him that hath no helper. He shall spare the poor and needy, and shall save the souls of the needy. [Who does that? Yahusha, Jesus, the Messiah]. He shall redeem their soul from deceit and violence: and precious shall their blood be in his sight. [Notice: how precious the blood is of the saints. That's a critical, critical point. We'll cover another time.] And he shall live, and to him shall be given of the gold of [Where does the gold come from?] Sheba:..."

What? the gold of Sheba and Hopkins wrote in his song "The Gold of Ophir." So was he wrong? No. Because the two are the same. They're the same area. It's the same gold -- the same region that the Bible refers

to over and over and over and over. We've created an entire series to show you how many times the Bible says Ophir, Sheba, Tarshish. They're the same place. Hello! Wake up! Wake up! Wake up! And that is Philippines, East, Orient, multitude of islands beyond the Arabian Sea. There's so many clues. It's all right there under our nose all of these years and Hopkins knew it when he wrote "We Three Kings" and the other song. Let's finish this excerpt.

"prayer also shall be made for him (Messiah) continually; and daily shall he be praised."

This Psalm is a prophecy of Yahusha (Jesus). So just who brings him presents? The kings of Tarshish and of the Isles of Ophir and Sheba. As we overwhelmingly proved previously in this series -- that is present day Philippines. Perhaps the reference in the song, "We Three Kings" is actually referring to the greater areas of Ophir, which is why he used the number three -- not because he believed there were three kings. Because we believe there's evidence he knew where the kings came from. So if he knew this passage, he knew that they identified more than three kings. But we'll explain. And that's why we believe that he used "We Three Kings." "Kings" because he knew this passage and three because he knew the greater areas of the Philippines or the land of Ophir at that point was Ophir, Sheba, and Tarshish -- three large areas, thus three kings. Not that there were only three because clearly there are not now.

So, okay, but what about the mention of Seba In this passage? I mean didn't we cover Seba before and it's Saba and that's Arabia and all. Now we're just confused, right? No, no. Let's look at this a little further and a little deeper.

We considered the name of Seba which we showed you in Part nine "Not Ophir" which originates from the word Saba. We know Seba was mentioned in the Table of Nations and founded Saba, land of the Sabians, mentioned many times in the Bible and that land is very clearly that area of Yemen, Arabia. We don't dispute that. However, just as you have names of cities today, like New York. Well, there's several New Yorks. Atlanta -- there's several Atlantas. There's several of many of the major cities around the world have several locations or other areas named after them. Not a rarity in history whatsoever. However David knew who the Sabians were and would have used that term, not Seba.

And he wouldn't have lumped it in with the areas that he knew where Ophir was that we've proven. He uses Seba here. The rest of the passage is overwhelmingly Ophir, as it names all three territories -- the isles, which is Ophir, we know, Tarshish and Sheba. This is all very, very clear. However there is a Seba in the Philippines, as well. Many forgot that Sabah, s-a-b-a-h, which is currently being leased by Malaysia is actually a part of the Philippines. Some try to dispute this but it's not a dispute. They're leasing it. They're paying the Philippines to lease it. Therefore it's Philippine property, not Malaysian. They're leasing it. Saba and Seba are the same and this passage now makes perfect sense. Notice Hopkins replaced Sheba with Ophir which is acceptable because the two are in the same place. We believe he was giving us clues to set this story straight, which is something he was forbidden to do by the Jesuits of his day. That's what we believe. That's speculation. The rest of this is not. The Bible is clear. Also regarding the number three we mentioned. And it is "kings," not "wise men" although they were wise men. The passage says there were more than one king from Tarshish because it was "kings." So at least two came from Tarshish, but likely many more. And of the isles it says "kings" and the isles are Ophir. So we know that there were at least two kings that came from Ophir. And finally "kings" of Sheba and Seba. Perhaps one from each? So at least two more. We don't know how many there were, but we know that there were at least six kings according to this passage, not three. For those wondering how you get "kings from the Philippines" which seem to have a flat level government at its highest level as we showed in our history video Part six, understand that this word for "king" is "malach" in Hebrew which means "kings" or "royals." They were the leaders by whatever title and there may have been very many who made the trip based on the number of Barungais [?] in the Philippines. This does not discount that. And now take a good look at where the gifts come from because they do not come from Ethiopia and Yemen, just as the Queen of Sheba in Solomon's story did not. Boy! They really want to take that away from the Philippines and scholars play into this, don't they? Where does this passage say the gold comes from? Sheba. And the song from Hopkins -- Ophir. Which are the same region -- modern day Philippines. But where do the other two gifts come from? From Tarshish, Ophir, the Isles Sheba and Seba, Sabah -- all in the Philippines. It all ties. It all fits. This is the meaning of this passage in our opinion indisputably. And we already know these elements are all native to the Philippines even if one tried to say it was "frankincense" and not "incense" even though it's clear it was

incense. And the word "frankincense" didn't even exist in that era. Come on! And myrrh also is a reference to a generic ointment, not the element that comes only from Arabia. This is all nonsense. It's junk scholarship meant to deceive all of us. Why would it matter to Yahusha that these elements as well as their bearers would come from Ophir of all places? Because he knew that Philippines was the special land of Havillah. See Part 10 for proof. We cannot go into that in this video. Just as Solomon knew the same and built a new port and new navy just to go to Ophir for resources his father, David, had already placed aside according to the Bible for the building of the Temple. Yet, he sent them anyway. He spent the money to take a three-year journey -- a dangerous journey -- risking everything the ships carried, as well. That is huge and tells you how significant the land of Ophir was. So we should have been searching for this for centuries. And yet you hear very little about it. Before watching this series many of you didn't even know the land of Ophir was even in the Bible. And do you see the similarities here?

Let's go back to the queen of Sheba's story.

I Kings 10:1

"And when the queen of Sheba heard of the fame of Solomon concerning the name of the Lord, she came to prove him with hard questions.

I Kings 10:10-11

"And she gave the king an hundred and twenty talents of gold, and of spices very great store, and precious stones: there came no more such abundance of spices as these which the queen of Sheba gave to king Solomon."

She came with spices -- incense. The Hebrew word that is interpreted spices here is the same root of the word interpreted from the Greek as "frankincense." Gold and spices, or gold, frankincense, incense and myrrh, ointment. It's the same. There is not a specific detail being brought out by the Bible here. Not when the word "frankincense" didn't even exist till the 3rd century. No, no. This is wrong. Yahuah (God) loves us enough to foreshadow and he loves his rich history. He played out the very same offerings on the altar at the birth of Yahusha (Jesus) as he did in the days of the Queen of Sheba. Wow! And these wise men from the East will rise up as Matthew 12:42 and Luke 11 30 says and return in the last days.

Isaiah 60 verse 9 The prophecy is written to Israel regarding the last days for the regathering of the tribes of Israel. It says

"Surely the Isles shall wait for me, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, unto the name of the Lord thy God (Yahuah,) and to the Holy One of Israel, because he hath glorified thee."

Who brings Israel back? Well, Yahuah (God) does. But who does he use according to this passage? The Isles -- Ophir and the ships of Tarshish. It's Ophir, Tarshish, and Sheba and what will they bring? Their gold and silver with them and likely spices, as well. Because Yahuah loves the synergy of history where you see the same thing -- the same pattern repeated. The wise and righteous kings, royals, who watched the stars for signs from Yahuah (God) hoping for Messiah, came from the East -- the Orient -- the land of Ophir, Sheba, Seba, and Tarshish. Okay. Are you thinking this through now? What exactly does all this mean? If this is true and we believe that the Holy Spirit has provided revelation here, who were the ancient Ophirians at the time of Yahuah's (Jesus') birth? They were followers of the Messiah intimately. To such a degree that they were watching the stars for his coming and Yahuah thought enough of their relationship with Him that he sent his star -- his Angel to guide them to Messiah with gifts. This means they were already brought to Jesus (Yahuah) from his very birth. Think about the ramifications of that. Which means they worshiped Him as they fell down on His or at His feet and gave him Temple -type offerings of great wealth to support his ministry. The myrrh may actually have been the ointment, and it wasn't "myrrh," but the ointment that they brought may have been used in his very burial. So did those Ophirians need to be converted to a religion to follow the same Messiah who they already knew? Of course. These kings, just as the Queen of Sheba did, would have returned with the most miraculous of encounters -- even more so than the Israelites from Egypt. So why would this need to be suppressed? Think about it. Because you cannot convert one to follow one whom they already follow. This is why we speculate, and we admit "speculate," that Thomas headed to Asia to get specifically to the land of Ophir. We know he died in India but we do not know where he went and how far he made it prior to that. Then, likely, some of the Israelites who left Judah at the destruction of the temple may well have ended up in Ophir, as well. We can't prove this, yet, but we will keep searching. And let's draw back a few verses here, while we are here

in Isaiah 60 and see the full context so you understand where this is coming from. Because this verse that we just read in verse 9 actually answers an important question that also ties things together even more.

Isaiah 60 verses 5 through 8 preceding the verse we just read:

Then thou shalt see, and flow together, [again talking to Israel in the last days] and thine heart shall fear, and be enlarged; because the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee, [abundance of the sea? Who could that be? Ophir, Tarshish, and Sheba. Keep reading.] the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee. The multitude of camels shall cover thee, [just like the story of the Queen of Sheba who came with a great train of camels. No, those don't come from the Philippines because it's what they bring once they make land. It's what they ride.] the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah; [that's just where the dromedaries come from. It doesn't mean that those are in the Philippines. They are not.] all they from Sheba shall come:"

Sheba where? The Philippines. Yes, this is Sheba, Ophir -- not Ethiopia -- the wrong Sheba. Because that one is not as significant in this reference. It's not mentioned. It's not here. It's really stretching it to try to pull that out of here because this phrase ends with a question and it is answered with Tarshish and Ophir and Sheba.

"they shall bring gold and incense;"

Who? Note: many modern Bibles make the same mistake here and translate this as "frankincense." That's not true. The KJV says incense, not frankincense, and it's the same word. Shouldn't have been frankincense in the other passages -- a new word which did not exist in the day that this was recorded. The King James uses the word "incense" here and it is accurate and it's the same word that should have been used in the story of the wise kings. I didn't say "men." I said "kings" because kings is accurate.

"and they shall shew forth the praises of the Lord (Yahuah).

verse 7 "All the flocks of Kedar..."

Remember from Part eight? Kedar means "dark-skinned" and even though it is capital here it is not in the original Hebrew so it doesn't have to mean Kedar where we're referring to Saudi Arabia but it can. It's fine. Really? Don't need to clarify that because so the sheep came from there. Big deal.

"shall be gathered together unto thee, the rams of Nebaioth shall minister unto thee: they shall come up with acceptance on mine altar, and I will glorify the house of my glory."

By the way, those flocks could also refer to the three shepherds. That may have been where they came from, because they also came at Jesus' birth -- not at the same exact time -- but the point is they came with offerings. So you know there's a lot more to this than we've been told.

verse 8 "Who are these that fly as a cloud, [so in other words -- come from afar] and as the doves to their windows?"

What do doves do? What do doves do in the flood story? It flew out and it came back. It returned. So who's returning here for an offering at Messiah's birth? The same one that came for the temple dedication. So it's the same. It's the same. It's Ophir, Sheba, Tarshish.

back to verse 9 which is the answer to this question at the end of this paragraph and it says

"Who are these?..."

See the Bible usually interprets itself as we've told you before and shown you -- demonstrated -- so many times. So let's read:

"Surely the isles (Ophir) shall wait for me, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring my sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, unto the name of the Lord thy God, and to the Holy One of Israel, because he hath glorified thee.

And earlier it says the gold of Sheba. This is Sheba, Ophir, Tarshish. This is that land. In regards to this wise king account in the Bible, it has been so twisted and, once again, it ends up in an occult direction. Is that okay

with you? Because it's not okay with us. But we would be absolutely remiss in not sharing the following slide showing an even further cover-up all based on a book that a guy may have written in the 6th century which he may have lived in, if he existed and actually wrote it, and if he was even a Christian and not a gnostic which, coming from Alexandria was likely, and we believe he was.

So first, these three kings -- wrong number -- wrong places -- and wrong names -- were sainted. Did you know that? These are Saints, which we won't even cover yet. But then -- Oh, I knew it. I knew he was going to blame the Catholic Church. Well, just who is propagating this false tale? Ah -- the Christian churches, too, by the way. So you're not off the hook. Some say we bash Catholics and let's be clear. We love you enough to tell you the truth and not come up with false narratives. You did not come up with this deception and we are not blaming Catholics. An Alexandrian gnostic did. And some disingenuous Catholic leaders propagated it. And you and I have been deceived by it for all of these years. For further illustration let's take a look at this.

[Slide title: Shrine of the Three Magi, cologne Cathedral, Germany]

This is a shrine which is a large, gilded and decorated, triple sarcophagus placed above and behind the altar -- the high altar of Cologne Cathedral. Ever wonder why the significant cathedrals in the Catholic church have to have bones of dead people behind or in or under the altars? Where does that practice come from? Because there's nothing in the Bible about that. But that's a whole nother thing. Let's finish reading.

This was "originally situated at Constantinople" at the very founding of the Catholic Church. Are you okay with this? If you're a Catholic are you really okay with this? Okay. Get angry at us. That's fine. Send us nasty messages. Go do all of that stuff. That's fine. We can handle it. We're grown-ups. But have you really thought this through? They have altered the very Bible to suppress your history -- the history of your people. And they have a good reason all right. They want to keep you from rising up which is a prophecy that they know, because the Jesuits at the top -- including the pope, who is a Jesuit, know full well who you are and what you are called to do in the last days. You may dismiss this and that is your prerogative. But you will miss out on the greatest move of God the

Philippines has ever seen, which will be even greater than the time of the queen of the South -- Seba Shabu Sheba -- and the time of the wise kings who returned who brought gifts to Yahusha (Jesus) after his birth and then returned with an awesome message. Are you tired of being suppressed? Remember this. We offered the Catholic Ten Commandments in our last video and they're right out of the Vatican catechism -- right out of it. They are an exact match. They're not just displayed around the Philippines. Those are the exact same ones. They have clearly skipped over the second commandment not to have graven images and bow down and worship them. We have gotten a few who push back trying to change the definition of worship, because that's actually what you're trying to do, which does not hold water, by the way. You will not find a scripture, either, to support this practice because it's not there. Those who you pray to you worship just as the pagans of the past and now do. But breaking the second commandment, especially for a people who worship Yahuah (God) and Yahusha, His Son, which we believe the Philippines did and still are attempting to do. But there's something in the way. It comes with a curse. Yes, a curse and the Jesuits knew this when they came here.

Exodus 20:4 through 6 right from the Catholic Bible:

"You shall not make yourself a carved image or any likeness of anything in heaven above or on earth beneath or in the waters under the earth."

By the way, we had someone argue with us that the Catholic Bible doesn't say this, but here it is. It does. It's right there. It's not called the the second commandment in the catechism, we agree. Because we tell you that that's been covered up disingenuously. And here's why. Because there's a curse that comes with it. So let's keep reading, because, see, the Jesuits knew this curse comes with this second commandment that was covered up.

verse 5 "You shall not bow down to them or serve them for I, Yahweh, your God, am a jealous God and I punish a parent's fault in the children, the grandchildren, and the great-grandchildren among those who hate me; [hate Him?] but I act with faithful love towards thousands of those who love me and keep my commandments."

We know that you desire to love Him. We don't believe for a second that there's one single Catholic here who does not love God. We believe that you do. We believe that you want to worship Him, but something's in the way and the reason it's in the way is because the Jesuits put it there as a stumbling block. Shows that they could do everything that we've talked about before and the very fruits that you've seen come out of that activity over the last 400 years. Notice, notice: you will be punished for three generations according to the Catholic Bible. However the King James says to the third and fourth generations. But that's fine. It's about the same. That's about 400 years and the Philippines has been suffering about mmm 400 years. We are very serious about this and that's why we mention it yet a second time. Because this is the reason the Philippines has suffered and some of you defend the very control system which enslaved you and continues to do so. Where is the gold of your ancestors which used to be passed from generation to generation in the very day that the Spanish came? Even still, do you have it? Does your brother? Does your sister? Your uncle? Your cousins? Anyone? Have you ever seen anyone mention those items? No. They're all missing until the Surigal Treasure was unearthed and now they're owned, not by the Philippines but they're owned by the Rockefellers -- the open Asian Society -- or whatever it's called. That's who owns that. Not the Philippines. And they're the ones putting it on display in Manila in the museum at Ayala Museum. They're the ones putting it on display in New York but it's their treasure. How did that happen? So, no. It's not yours and why? But here's the good news. Here's the good news! This curse is being lifted because it's been almost 400 years now. Now is the time to shake off this control system completely and rid the Philippines of this curse. This is why we continually mention this. This matters.

So it is time for the Queen of the South to rise up in judgment with this generation and condemn it.

Matthew 12:42

"... for she came from the uttermost parts of the earth [Ophir, Sheba, Philippines] to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and, behold, a greater than Solomon is here."

Thank you, Yahusha. By the way, we checked out this scripture in the Catholic Bible, as well, and they added three words at the front of this passage which are not there in the original Hebrew. Why? Again,

attempting to suppress you from rising up. They added "On Judgment Day" to the beginning, meaning you're not to rise up now. No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no! Not in the end times even. No, no not until Judgment Day, which at that point we're all re-risen. We've all been resurrected from the dead. But is that true? No, it's not in the original Hebrew. It's not in the King James. It's not actually in any of the translations we looked at except the Catholic Bible and it's wrong. Very, very wrong. See, they're trying to say you shouldn't rise up until after Yahusha (Jesus) returns -- not during the time of the reign of the Catholic Church. Ouch! Yeah, we know. Is this okay with you? I mean are you really okay with this? Because we are not. And we'll leave it at that.

Thank you for watching or Solomon's Gold Series. Please subscribe to our YouTube channel and view our website at thegodculture.com. Always remember to "prove all things for yourself." If you do not like what we have said here, dig into the Bible and prove us wrong. Don't tell us we hate Catholics because we love Catholics. We love you enough to tell you the truth and someone else has not been (*telling you the truth*). The people of the Philippines are called to a higher purpose and you do not need to be held back any longer by deceptions.

Rise up In the Name of Yahusha. Rise up. Amen.