

DOES PETER GOODGAME HAVE SOUNDLY BASED DOCTRINE?

I'd like to do a little editorial of an article that someone has posted on Facebook. I had occasioned this day to have an electronic conversation via Facebook with Peter Goodgame. Peter has posted an article that can be found at the following address: [Source: <https://www.facebook.com/peter.goodgame.18?fref=ts>]

As many of you know, I am a Torah Observant Jew who not only believes in Yeshua (Jesus), I actually believe Yeshua. There is a difference. Even the devil believes in Yeshua, but he doesn't believe Yeshua because he's in constant rebellion against Yeshua. I'm not equating Mr. Goodgame with the devil, no, far from that. Peter has written some thought-provoking works and is a good researcher. However, Peter is like you, me and everyone else; we can make mistakes. Owing up to mistakes and correcting them is a different story. Some of us are humble and we can be gently rebuked and we see the err of our ways and we change, otherwise known as repenting. Repenting means to make a 180-degree change, basically, to walk the other way. I'm praying that Peter will listen to the Ruach Ha Kodesh, repent and recant some of his views.

Being Jewish and having paid a price for my heritage, I am sort of on the lookout for catchwords, phrases, actions and other things that malign Jews, both Messianic, Religious and secular, if they are wronged, mislabeled or maligned. One belief that is growing leaps and bounds within the Church community is the heresy called Replacement Theology. This doctrine from hell states in essence that because the Jews rejected Jesus, they are outcasts forever, forever rejected by Yahweh and that they've lost any election that they either had or were promised. Those of us who read the Bible and take it literally know that this is a humongous pile of bovine scat.

One way that these heretics accomplish their twisting of scripture is to "spiritualize" scripture in place of taking it literally. I believe that scripture should be taken both ways; it is living spiritual entity created by Yahweh, but each and every word is meant for literal interpretation. To take the Bible as only being literal is just turning it into a story book and to say that it is only spiritual is to turn it into the likes of any other mystical book. The Bible is a packaged deal, all of it and none of its contents are outdated or cancelled out because of other parts. Yeshua himself said:

For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Matthew 5:18

In modern terms, he was saying something like, Till heaven and earth pass, not one crossing of a “T” or dotting of an “i” will pass away from the Torah, till all be fulfilled.

Facebook has a lot of annoying things called “groups,” which is where people go to argue with each other. In essence, one group believes one thing and they debate with another group who believes differently. Somehow, I was drawn into one of these groups. This particular group was talking about whether the Sabbath should be honored on Saturday or Sunday. I was very impressed with this group because with the exception of one argumentative man, everyone was getting along. Usually, these groups are filled with people with very little scriptural knowledge, poor research skill and general pompous attitudes and sooner or later you find yourself wishing that you could travel through the electronic medium and wrap your hands around some throats while you shake their heads wondering if there is anything inside the cranium.

While perusing this group, I noticed that there was another topic started just below the one that I was working with. This group was from author Peter Goodgame. I met Peter once while on a trip down to Roswell, New Mexico for one of the Christian events down there. He had just published a book and was telling me about it, and what he believed. I thought his doctrine to be a little off, but it didn’t violate the foundational truth of our faith so I just dismissed it as being something that he and I would have agree to disagree about. I found him to be a pleasant man with a lot of zeal for what he was promoting and I felt that he loved Yeshua. I use past tense because I haven’t talked to him for some time and people change, so I can’t be sure totally what he believes, except for the exchange that we had today on Facebook.

So, I clicked on his link and found an article which contained the following body:

The True Fulfillment of God’s Promise to Abraham

*In the OT the Jews knew they were the chosen people and they lived under the promise of Genesis 12:3, “**I will bless those that bless thee and curse those that curse thee...**” This was an amazing promise of protection to Abraham and his seed, but this promise found an end in Jesus Christ: “**... and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.**”*

Jesus Christ was the ultimate Chosen Person and the truth is that those who bless Jesus will be blessed and those that curse Jesus will be cursed, regardless of their genetic background. Furthermore, if you are “In Him” and have your name written in His Book of Life then you are Chosen as well. However, in the New Covenant God’s Chosen People don’t get to walk around like the OT Jews did saying, “We are the Chosen People! Don’t mess with us!” No indeed, in the New Covenant Jesus turns this promise

into an obligation. Instead of having a smug self-righteous attitude we are to walk in humility and extend to others the very blessings that Jesus extended to us.

In Matthew 25 Jesus transforms the promise of Genesis 12 into an obligation that rests upon His true Chosen People. We are called to love those that are least loved in this world, and to identify the hungry, the thirsty, the sick, the strangers, the naked and the prisoners as Jesus Himself. Then those that bless Jesus will be blessed and inherit the Kingdom, whereas those that curse Jesus will themselves be cursed and cast into eternal darkness:

*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 hungred, 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 hungred, 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 hungred, 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. (Matthew 25:31-46)*

Genesis 12:3 does not apply to the physical descendants of Abraham now that we live in the time of the New Covenant. The physical has been transformed into the spiritual and Jesus has ironically flipped it in Matthew 25. It is no longer a promise, but an obligation and a mandate for those who claim to be God's people to love those who need God's love the most. [Source: <https://www.facebook.com/peter.goodgame.18?fref=ts>] [Bold texts were in the article]

Whenever I read an article and I see words like, "The True Fulfillment," or "The True Chosen People," it sends red flags up. I've used similar terms before to differentiate one group from another. I use the term "true believers" all the time to distinguish people who believe Yeshua from people who just "believe in Yeshua." As mentioned above, there is a big difference.

Now, let me affirm that the Bible does teach that there are different types of Jews or Children of Israel. The Bible calls those who were in the Sanhedrin who condemned Yeshua a variety of “not so nice” words. It refers to the “Jews that Crucified Yeshua,” which many have misinterpreted as being all Jews, when it really refers to the religious and wealthy Jews of Jesus’ time. Many Jews believed Jesus during his ministry and after it ended. The disciples and Apostles were Jewish, and so on and so forth. The 10 Lost Tribes of Israel were scattered all over the known world in the 8th Century BC, during Jesus’ time and even today.

When I first read Peter’s doctrine, the following caught my eye:

In the OT the Jews knew they were the chosen people and they lived under the promise of Genesis 12:3, “I will bless those that bless thee and curse those that curse thee...” This was an amazing promise of protection to Abraham and his seed, but this promise found an end in Jesus Christ: “... and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.”

And He drives the point of replacement theology at the end by substituting the physical heirs of Abraham with only the Spiritual heirs of Abraham by saying:

Genesis 12:3 does not apply to the physical descendants of Abraham now that we live in the time of the New Covenant. The physical has been transformed into the spiritual and Jesus has ironically flipped it in Matthew 25. It is no longer a promise, but an obligation and a mandate for those who claim to be God’s people to love those who need God’s love the most.

When I saw that Peter was saying that the promises to Israel had ended with Jesus, that immediately made me think that perhaps Peter is into replacement theology, and I stated so in a comment to his page. He fired right back that he what he wrote was not “replacement theology,” and that I mistook what he said. I’m sort of at a disadvantage because what I am recalling I am doing so from memory. I will explain why I only have memory to pull from in a few minutes. I also told Peter that the promises to Abraham were to the Physical seed of Abraham as well as the Spiritual seed of Abraham. He also mentioned something about the Torah being fulfilled totally in Jesus.

I again said that the promise pertained to All of the seed of Abraham. This is when it got really strange.

I got another reply from Peter, stating that Jesus had actually become Israel and it was Israel that hung on the cross. I wrote back to him asking him if he could provide any proof

in scripture where it says that Jesus was Israel, or any prophetic mention stating such a claim or inferring one. I got back a garbled message that made really no sense. I asked him if his assertion was correct, then did that mean that all of Israel ascended with Jesus into heaven, seeing that He had become Israel. I never got a reply as to that, or a reply that made any sense. I've heard of Jesus being called many things in scripture, but I had never heard of him being called Israel. I also mused in laughter as to if Jesus was the King of the Jews, and He was also Israel, then was He his own King? You see, what really bothered me about his claim, aside from it being heresy, is that there is a myth in the more orthodox Jewish communities that Isaiah 53 talks about Israel, not Messiah. I've been yelled at by many of my Jewish brothers stating that I was a fool because Isaiah was referring to the suffering of Israel. I wonder if Goodgame realizes that he's borrowing from the myth of a people that he says doesn't exist anymore. Here is a list of Major and Minor Rabbis that have written commentaries that agree with Goodgame, that the atoning death on the cross was Israel, as Goodgame asserts:

MAJOR RABBIS:

I would like to first examine those Rabbis whose status and authority are indisputable within Jewish tradition and by Orthodox Jews today. When they say something, Orthodox Jews listen. I will first go through those who appear in the Mikros Gadolos and then to the other major Rabbis who wrote commentaries.

Mikros Gadolos:

Rabbi Yosef Kara: French exegete who lived at the time of Rashi or slightly before that. He authored a commentary on Nach. He explains Isaiah 53 as referring to **Israel**.

Rabbi Abraham Ibn Ezra: 12th century Spanish Rabbi, author of a commentary on the Tenach and various works on grammar and other subjects. Ibn Ezra explains Isaiah 53 as referring to **Israel**.

Rabbi David Kimchi: Also known as the RaDaK, lived in the 13th century and wrote an important commentary on the Tenach and works on grammar. Radak explains Isaiah 53 as referring to **Israel**.

Rabbi Yechiel Hillel ben David: 18th century Rabbi and author of the commentaries on the Nach called Metzudos Dovid, and Metzudos Tzion. The former is an explanation of the text and the later deals with issues of grammar and word meaning. He explains Isaiah 53 as referring to **Israel**

Rabbi Meir Leibish Malbim: 19th century Rabbi who wrote a commentary on most of Nach. His commentaries include explanations of the words and their grammar and a simple commentary on the meaning of the text. He explains Isaiah 53 as referring to **Israel**.

Some may see a conspiracy here; with all these people following lockstep with Rashi, but that can be dispelled by looking at another prophecy which some Christians see as Messianic, Isaiah 42:1-4. Rashi says it refers to Israel as does Ibn Ezra, Rabbi Yosef Kara says it is about Cyrus, and the Radak, Metzudos and the Malbim say it is about Moshiach. These Rabbis did not follow Rashi like puppets. They carefully examined the text and when the literal meaning seemed different to what Rashi said, they were always ready to disagree. That they all agree is a sign that those who are the most learned when they search for the literal meaning can come to only one conclusion: Isaiah 53 is about Israel. We will see that this is the case with the other Rabbis we will examine.

Most of the major Rabbis attained that status for their writings on the Talmud or Jewish Law. There are very few major Rabbis with commentaries on Isaiah 53 that are not in the Mikros Gadolos.

Rabbi Moshe ben Nachman: Rabbi from the 13th century known for his important commentaries on the Talmud and the Torah. He is called the RaMBaN by Jews and Nachmonides by the non-Jewish world. Except for his commentary on the book of Job, we have no commentary on any of the other books of Nach from him. I have written [an article](#) in more detail about this already.

This passage is a polemical answer, and not a commentary. This commentary was written because in his debate with apostate Pablo Christiani he was challenged with the Midrash Tanchuma that applied Isaiah 52:13 to the Messiah. This was supposed to be a proof that Isaiah 53 was about the Messiah. The Ramban stated that Isaiah 53 was about **Israel**, but that he could explain it according to the Midrash, and that it does not support the idea that the Messiah dies as the Christians contend. The selection in Driver is that explanation which he subsequently wrote.

Don Yitzchok Abarbanel: 15th/16th century commentator and political figure in the court of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain. He was the author of commentaries on Tenach which have achieved wide acceptance. His commentary on Isaiah 53 starts off polemical and follows the view that it applies to **Israel**, although he mentions **King Josiah** as an alternative.

Rabbi Moshe Al Sheich: 16th century Rabbi from Sefad. I have [an article](#) explaining his view where I have shown that his commentary is more of a Midrashic sermon. He explains Isaiah 53 based on a Midrash that refers to the suffering of the **righteous**.

An examination of these Rabbis shows that we have 8, but only 6 of them can legitimately be called literal commentaries. The other two are Midrashic. The Ramban has a polemical commentary to show that if one takes the Midrashic view that it is the Messiah, it still does not support the Christian view. The final one, by the Al Sheikh, is a sermon/Midrashic commentary and is about the suffering of the righteous based on a Midrash that talks about suffering.

To address Peter's assertion that the whole Torah was fulfilled with Yeshua's death on the cross, I posted the following scripture, the words of Yeshua Himself:

For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Matthew 5:18

For me, and where the Torah is concerned, this is sort of the litmus test that tells me if a person is worth any more of my time in discussion. Usually I get other scriptures that dispute my claim, that claim being that if Jesus said it, that should settle it. However, Goodgame threw me a curve ball. I was told, "Not all of the words spoken by Jesus can be taken literally, some are spiritual in nature only." When I dropped those words on the litmus paper of sound scripture the paper showed it to be highly acidic, polluted and Antichrist in nature. Now I'm not calling Goodgame the Antichrist, but I am saying that his doctrine is Antichrist in nature. It brought me all the way back to the beginning, in Genesis where the Nachash asked Chava, "Did Elohim REALLY say???" Perhaps when Elohim told Adam and Chava not to touch the tree, it was a metaphor, and maybe they even took it that way, who knows. I do know that they didn't take Yahweh Elohim literally and that is why we're in the mess that we're in today.

Finally, at the end of our discourse, Goodgame wrote back to me stating that he stands firmly on his beliefs and he will not change them. I wrote back to him thanking him and asking him to leave his posts on Facebook. I told him that I wanted to direct people to his heretical views so that they could see what he was all about. I left to have a bite to eat and returned to discover that Goodgame had removed that particular post with all of our discourse. I guess that his understanding on standing firmly and mine are different. You can however go to the following link and read the article that I quoted above and see his stance for yourself, minus our conversation, and you won't see his stance on Jesus' words not being literal there either. However, I attest that the conversation did occur and now you know who you are dealing with and the some of his beliefs that are foundational to his way of looking at Yeshua and Yahweh's word; oh, and the replacement theology that is interwoven in his doctrine.

Again, I want to affirm that this is an editorial of something by Peter Goodgame that was publicly posted on the internet and being so is subject to editorial review and criticism.