

You Can't Have Your Cake and Enoch Too – Guy Malone's Flip-Flop on The Veracity of the Book of 1 Enoch

YOU CAN'T HAVE YOUR CAKE AND ENOCH TOO!

Way back in the early years of the 21st Century there was a fellow named Guy Malone. Guy had blazed a new trail; one that led to Roswell, New Mexico, and one that would find him constantly in the light of controversy. You see, Guy was one of those people who claimed that he was abducted by aliens, except he came to town with a new message; these supposed aliens were not from outer space like so many in the scientific community contended and wanted to believe. No, Guy's message was that these entities are spiritual in nature, namely, fallen angels that somehow physically manifest.

While there was not a lot hard biblical evidence that this was true there were some suggestions in scripture that his message held water, but the real proof came in a little known book called The Book of Enoch, or to be more on the spot, First Enoch, so as not to confuse it with to other books that have similar titles and are Gnostic in nature. This Book of Enoch was a relatively new rediscovery; found amidst the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Ethiopian Bible as one of their canonical books.

Guy came under a lot of attack as do all people who even “dare” to mention that they got some of their information from the Book of Enoch. You see, back in the old days, when the Church Fathers were finagling around to determine which books were actually inspired by the Holy Spirit they dismissed some of the books and the Book of Enoch joined other books that would be relegated as uninspired by men who themselves were probably lacking the unction of the Holy Spirit.

In the late 20th Century, when the book of human dominion of Earth started to draw to a close people started to take note of Enoch again. The book seemed to allude to modern physics and natural laws that have only recently been rediscovered. Also, the book is noted for explaining in great detail the antediluvian world (the world before the flood); the rebellion of angels, their cavorting with human females and the creation of unnatural offspring. With the revelations that this book was bringing people were starting to see that the incidents that occurred before the flood were starting to occur again, specifically where the fallen angels and

women are concerned. They saw many parallels between the antics of the fallen angels before the flood and modern day alien abduction.

With this in mind, Guy Malone decided to delve into a study to prove the validity of the Book of Enoch. He wanted to show that it is a valuable book; one worthy of consideration when researching the modern world and all its parallels with Noah's day. In these earlier years Malone was convinced that Enoch was a valid book and that it filled in so many gaps that Genesis left for interpretation, or misinterpretation. In this work and this study Malone is to be applauded because he was right and he was going to stick to his guns on the matter.

The problem then arose where Guy and some of his associates had a change of heart concerning the book of Enoch. His association with another researcher who adamantly teaches that alien abduction, or fallen angel harassment is spiritual only in nature; psychic or in one's head so to speak, has caused this once ardent researcher (Guy) to turn the rudder hard left and send the ship in the opposite direction. Perhaps only Guy and Yahweh know why he has made this about-face decision; perhaps a few close friends know too, but it is very odd that someone who wrote the article below, and wrote it with such conviction and obvious hard working research could just "change his mind" about something so crucial; so intrinsic to the Christian UFO Research Realm.

Presented below is Guy's article on the Book of Enoch and his strong defense of the ancient text. Perhaps someone who reads this blog entry would like to ask him how such a rapid departure from the obvious truth could occur. And finally, one last thing before his article, the question has to be asked; if he can flip-flop on this issue like he obviously has, is he correct about his other ideas and/or assertions? Can he be trusted with rightly dividing the truth and why is he, and his other associates so intent on destroying the ministries of those will not bend and change like he has. Perhaps some day we'll know the answers to those questions, but myself, and others I've talked to just cannot at this time take any such person seriously about any sort of doctrinal issue; especially when he can flip on a dime and give you nine cents change.

So here is the article for your consideration. Please note that the links in the article are now defunct and he has removed the information since he has changed his mind. Also note that I have not made any grammatical changes, or fixed any punctuation errors like I normally would. This is because Malone is quite litigious in nature.

The Case for Enoch, by Guy Malone (History of the Book of Enoch)

Chapter Eleven – The Case for Enoch

by Guy Malone

(Originals located

at http://www.alienresistance.org/book_of_enoch.htm and http://www.alienresistance.org/sons_of_seth.htm

“At that time I beheld the Ancient of Days, while he sat upon the throne of his glory, while the book of the living was opened in his presence, and while all the powers which were above the heavens stood around and before him.” – Book of Enoch 47:3 (Ethiopic, Artisan pub)

Since it's English translation in the 1800's from texts found in Ethiopia in 1768, The Book of Enoch (known today as 1st Enoch) has made quite a stir in academic circles. 1 Enoch has been authenticated as existing and in wide use before the church age (most scholars now date it at 200 BC). Multiple copies were discovered in 1948 in the Dead Sea Scrolls. This of course has caused many to wonder why it is not included in modern Bibles...

“Thou has seen what Azazyel has done, how he has taught every species of iniquity upon the earth... Samyaza also has taught sorcery... They have gone together to the daughters of men, have lain with them... The women likewise have brought forth giants...” Enoch 9:5-8

Parts of The Book of Enoch tell the story of wicked angels who abducted and mated with human women, resulting in the hybrid race known throughout secular and Biblical history as the Nephilim (giants, KJV).

While this account encompasses only the first four verses of Genesis 6 (but see also Genesis 3:15, 2 Peter 2:4-6, Jude 6-7), Enoch 1 relates this story in great detail. It lists the names of 18 “prefect” angels – of 200 – who committed this sin. According to the text, these angels also taught mankind the “making of swords and knives, shields and breastplates (metallurgy); ... magical medicine, dividing of roots (medicinal and hallucinogenic use); incantations, astrology, the seeing of the stars, the course of the moon, as well as the deception of man.”

By Noah’s time, “The earth also was corrupt (wasting – KJV notation) before God, and the earth was filled with violence... all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth.” (Gen 6:10-11) Afraid of the consequences, these angels appeal to Enoch to intercede with God on their behalf; God instead uses Enoch to deliver a message of judgment against them. Aside from the “taking of wives,” God states that he would not forgive them for teaching mankind magical arts and warlike ways. As summarized by Pastor Chris Ward:

“According to the Book of Enoch (Not a Canonical Text), God judged the angels for producing the Nephilim. God decreed that the fallen angels (Watchers) were to be cast into Tartarus. The Nephilim were also judged and it was determined that their bodies were to return to the earth in peace but their souls were doomed to wander the earth forever (as) wandering spirits...” (Pastor Chris’s Enoch web page, www.logoschristian.org/enoch.htm which reprints this dialogue between God and Enoch, and his The Origin of Demons web page www.logoschristian.org/demon.htm)

The increasing acceptance and popularization of this important book among theologians helps cast light on the extra-terrestrial hypothesis (ETH) in general. Enoch is an ancient writing, which states that angels (not true space aliens, as stated by many UFO cults, and popular modern authors Erich Von Daniken and Zechariah Sitchin) visited ancient Earth and polluted mankind’s DNA. While this case can easily be made solely from the canonized Bible (see Gen 2:1, 3:15, 6:1-4, Dan 2:43, Matt 24:37, Rom 1:21-25, 2 Cor 11:14-15, Eph 6:12, 2 Pet 2:4-6, Jude 1:6-7), Enoch is yet another witness against these incorrect interpretations of Earth’s predeluvian era (i.e., before the flood of Genesis 6). The fact that they also gave mankind technology, which supposedly “advanced our race” (but which we actually used to destroy each other, and to incur God’s judgment), lends itself to a more sinister understanding of today’s UFO phenomenon...

Genesis 6 / Book of Enoch	Today / Any episode of the X-Files
Supernatural Beings identified as angels	Supernatural Beings identified as ET’s

Took as wives “any whom they chose”	Abduction Phenomenon
Hybrid Race of Nephilim	Accounts of Missing Fetuses, Hybrids, Cloning
Introduced Destructive Technology: Weapons of Warfare / Psychotropic Drugs / Astrology & Sorcery	Hitler’s Foo Fighters / Roswell Crash / “Back-engineering” of Stealth Bombers, etc / Occult Arts, New Age Doctrines
Worshipped as Gods (Annanuki) /Nephilim hybrids were “heroes of old, men of renown...” Gen 6:4 – the factual basis for Greco-Roman deities	Zechariah Sitchin / UFO Cults / Immunity for Abduction Crimes /Called “Spirit Guides, Ascended Masters and/or “Space Brothers”

FAQ:

Q: What other evidences for Enoch’s authenticity (as a sacred text) are there? Why isn’t it in the Bible today? Jesus said that angels can’t have sex, proving this book’s falsehood...

A: The idea that Jesus said that angels cannot have sex is a very common objection to The Book of Enoch and the angelic understanding of Genesis 6 in general. However it is also a very common misinterpretation of what he actually said.

Matthew 22:29-30

“Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.” (KJV)

“Jesus replied, “You are in error because you do not know the Scriptures or the power of God. At the resurrection people will neither marry nor be given in marriage; they will be like the angels in heaven.” (NIV)

“But Jesus answered them, You are wrong, because you know neither the scriptures nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven.” (RSV)

Looking carefully and without a preconceived notion, we see that Jesus said that the angels “in heaven” DO NOT marry (nor presumably – have sex, reproduce). He did not state that angels “in general” CAN NOT do so. An unmarried Christian who – like the angels of God in heaven – wishes to remain obedient to God’s will, “does not” have sex, but not because he or she is physically incapable of doing so.

That angels cannot have sex would be a fair interpretation of this passage, if this were the only passage in scripture that came close to dealing with the topic. It is not however, and therefore any interpretation of this scripture will be in accord with all else that is written. Jude 6 and 2 Peter 2:4-6 clearly indicate that the sin of these angels was sexual in nature, affirming the hybrid understanding of Genesis 6.

When they “shape-shift,” angels can appear like perfectly normal humans (Heb 13:2). We know from the Old Testament that they not only appear human, but that they can eat food as well (Genesis 18:6-8; 19:3. In fact, angels eat when in their “normal” state – Psalm 78:24-25 tells us that manna is the “food of angels”). There is no reason to assume that angels do not contain all the physical properties of a normal human being, when assuming human form. However, they are not human, which goes a long way towards understanding why their children were “superhuman” (known as the heroes of old, men of renown, legends, Titans, Giants... depending upon your Bible translation.)

While far-fetched or disturbing to some, Matthew 22:30 simply does not dogmatically infer that sexual reproduction is a physical impossibility for angelic beings. In fact, since Jesus specified the angels “in heaven,” one would have to go beyond what is actually written (AND ignore what else IS written) to state that angels that ARE NOT in heaven – fallen – seeking to thwart God’s purposes – CAN NOT have sex.

As Jesus said above, “Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures...” Taken as a whole, the entire body of scripture indicates otherwise.

Which brings up the question, WHY would they do so?

“...the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful...” Gen 6:2 NIV

Quite simply, “lust” would be the most obvious and scriptural answer.

Beyond that misunderstanding, there is no doubt today that The Book of Enoch was one of the most widely accepted and revered books of Jewish culture and doctrine in the century leading up to Jesus’ birth.

It is usually noted first that New Testament author Jude directly quotes from 1 Enoch. “Behold he comes with ten thousands of his saints to execute judgment...” (1 Enoch 2, Jude 14-15). Additionally, “the citations of Enoch by the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs... show that at the close of the second century B.C., and during the first century B.C., this book was regarded in certain circles as inspired” (1).

Aside from Jude, Peter and Paul’s affirmations of the angelic/hybrid interpretation, recognition of 1 Enoch “... is given amply in the Epistle of Barnabus, and in the third century by Clement and Irenaeus” (1). The Catholic Church’s Origen – known as “the father of theology” – affirmed both the Book of Enoch and the fact that angels could and did co-habitate with the daughters of men. He even warned against possible angelic and/or Nephilim infiltration of the church itself. Oddly, while thousands of his writings are still considered by them as “sacred,” this very issue got him labeled as a heretic when the faulty Sons of Seth “doctrine” was conceived! (2)

Additionally, the Coptic Orthodox Churches of Egypt (est’d appx 50-100 A.D.) still include Enoch as canonized text in the Ethiopic Old Testament (2). This fact alone should carry great weight for Western Christians when honestly studying the “case” for Enoch. Given their 1900+ year history, the fact that they were never “ruled” by Rome’s theology, and that they currently number over 10 million – this is a very significant portion of The Body of Christ that has historically esteemed 1 Enoch as inspired doctrine.

Some today (who do not seem to believe in the inspiration of scripture) claim that most major themes of the New Testament were in fact “borrowed” from 1 Enoch. “It appears that Christianity later adopted some of its ideas and philosophies from this book, including the Final Judgment, the concept of demons, the Resurrection, and the coming of a Messiah and Messianic Kingdom” (3). No doubt, these themes are major parts of 1 Enoch, and appear there as complete theologies a full 200 years before any other NT writings.

Christian author Stephen Quayle writes, “Several centuries before and after the appearance of Jesus in Jerusalem, this book had become well known to the Jewish community, having a profound impact upon Jewish thought. The Book of Enoch gave the Jews their solar calendar, and also appears to have instilled the idea that the coming Messiah would be someone who had pre-existed as God (4).” Translator RH Charles also stated that “the influence of 1 Enoch on the New Testament has been greater than all of the other apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books put together” (3). The conclusions are somewhat inescapable given Enoch’s dating and wide acceptance between 200 B.C. and 200 A.D. Either Christian authors, and especially the Nicene Council, did plagiarize their theology directly from Enoch, or the original version of Enoch was also inspired.

James H Charlesworth, director of Dead Sea Studies at Yale University, says in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha & The New Testament* (Trinity Press International), “I have no doubt that the Enoch groups deemed the Book of Enoch as fully inspired as any biblical book. I am also convinced that the group of Jews behind the Temple Scroll, which is surely pre-Qumranic, would have judged it to be quintessential Torah — that is, equal to, and perhaps better than, Deuteronomy.... Then we should perceive the Pseudepigrapha as they were apparently judged to be: God’s revelation to humans(2 & 5).”

But perhaps the most telling argument for 1 Enoch’s “inspiration” may well be that the Jewish understanding of the term “Son of Man” as a Messianic title comes – not truly from our Old Testament canon – but from the Book of Enoch! Ever wonder why Jesus refers to himself in the gospels as the “Son of Man” rather than the Son of God? (2) Of over 100 uses of the phrase “son of man” in the OT, it refers almost always to “normal” men (93 times specifically of Ezekiel, and certainly not as Messiah!), but is used only one time in the entire OT, in one of Daniel’s heavenly visions, to refer to divinity. Despite the Old Testament’s frequent lack of divine application of the phrase, 1 Enoch records several trips to heaven, using the title “Son of Man” unceasingly to refer to the pre-incarnate Christ. Of particular Messianic significance, Enoch describes the following scene (2):

The angels “glorify with all their power of praise; and He sustains them in all that act of thanksgiving while they laud, glorify and exalt the name of the Lord of Spirits forever and ever... Great was their joy. They blessed, glorified and exalted because the name of the Son of Man was revealed to them (1 Enoch 68:35-38).”

Both His disciples, and especially the Sanhedrin knew what Jesus was claiming – 84 times in the gospels! – when referring to Himself as the “Son of Man.” This claim was considered an obvious blasphemy to the Pharisees & Sadducees, but it is eternal life to all who confess that Jesus of Nazareth was, and is, the Son of Man, The Messiah, God in the flesh, The Holy One of Israel, God’s Christ – the Lord of All to whom every knee shall bow (Philippians 2:8-10).

Using “normal rules” of scriptural interpretation, we are never to draw firm doctrine from only one passage of scripture. Right? Daniel’s single use of “Son of Man” (in a “night vision” at that – Dan 7:13), would not be sufficient to claim that the phrase is indeed Messianic, especially given the other 107 times it is not used in that way. 1 Enoch is the missing “second witness” needed (according to all other rules of interpretation) to understand the phrase’s double meaning as an enduring Messianic title. It has been argued ever since Enoch’s first English translation, that by using this title so familiar to the Jews, Jesus was actually affirming the truth of this book, that the prophet was taken on many trips to heaven before his “final” translation, and that He was the one whom Enoch saw there – the pre-existent Son of Man, whom Enoch prophesied would judge the souls of all men.

Interestingly, Daniel is ALSO the only OT use of the term “watcher” to ever refer to angels (Daniel 4:13, 17, 23 KJV). Strong’s Concordance defines a watcher as a “guardian angel” (Strong’s 5894). “The distinguishing character of the Watcher (opposed to other angels in the canon) appears to be that it spends much time among men, overseeing what they are doing. It is also interesting to note that both times one of these angels appeared to Daniel, he took pains to note that it was “an holy one,” suggesting that some Watchers are not aligned with God while others are (4).” Found nowhere else in the OT canon but the book of Daniel, “watcher” is patently Enoch’s term for these angels. Likewise, Daniel alone used Enoch’s term “Son of Man” to refer to the pre-incarnate Christ, adding further intrigue to the case for 1 Enoch’s inspiration, and an overall understanding of it’s doctrinal acceptance among both Old and New Testament writers.

What we lose out on today by not examining 1 Enoch – even if only for its historical significance – is that it is perhaps actually more splendid than any other book in our canon in its exultation of Christ as King! It also gives clear, stern and oft-repeated warnings to the unsaved of swift destruction at the Coming of The Lord, but is also full of amazing promises of future glory for the elect! We are of course wise to stay clear of dangerous heresy, but... ask yourself if the below sounds like false doctrine? Keep in mind, this was written at least 200 years before Christ walked the earth, and perhaps before Noah's birth:

“Then shall the kings, the princes, and all who possess the earth, glorify Him who has dominion over all things, Him who was concealed; for from eternity the Son of Man was concealed, whom the Most High preserved in the presence of His power and revealed to the elect.

He shall sow the congregation of the saints, and of the elect; and all the elect shall stand before Him in that day. All the kings, the princes, the exalted, and those who rule over the earth shall fall down on their faces before Him, and shall worship Him. They shall fix their hopes on this Son of Man...

Then the sword of the Lord of Spirits shall be drunk from them (the lost); but the saints and the elect shall be safe in that day; nor the face of the sinners and the ungodly shall they thence-forth behold. The Lord of Spirits shall remain over them; And with this Son of Man shall they dwell, eat, lie down, and rise up for ever and ever...” Enoch 61:10-13

Literally Translated from the Ethiopic by Richard Laurence LL.D. Archbishop of Cashel
Late Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford

“For more than a century, scholars and church officials debated as to whether or not certain gospels, epistles and apocalypses should be included. For instance, it was long debated which to include in the canon, the Book of Revelation, or the Book of Enoch...”Liberty Magazine – December 7, 1935 (1)

Q: OK! OK! So why is it not in the Bible?

A: Uncertain as well as multiple authorship, and several slightly varying texts are among the main reasons cited for Enoch not “making it” into the generally recognized canon. In truth, the spiritual agenda(s) of the early Roman Church is most likely the ultimate reason however, and

we will examine this agenda here as well. Let's begin with the first two though, before moving to the more incredulous, but quite valid "conspiracy theories."

"The Book of Enoch, like the book of Daniel, was originally written in Aramaic, and partly in Hebrew (1)." While there may have been Hebrew translations during the centuries B.C. (which early church leaders may or may not have had access to), today only the Ethiopic manuscripts exist, as well as some incomplete Greek and Latin translations, plus one Aramaic fragment from the Dead Sea Scrolls. By the time of Jesus' birth, "average" Jews were reading mainly the Greek Septuagint translation of their own Torah (completed 200 B.C.), as a result of their years of foreign captivity and the then current Roman occupation. To coin the vernacular, they had been assimilated. So unless an authentic Aramaic version appears miraculously today, there will never be any completely indisputable way to argue for a modern "canonization" of 1 Enoch, as the originals are lost, probably forever.

The honest problem facing the infant Roman Church of 390 A.D., when first assembling today's Bible, was that the existing copies of 1 Enoch varied, albeit in minor ways. "Unlike the (rest of the) Bible which was carefully copied and checked for errors by Jewish and Christian scribes throughout its history, The Book of Enoch is available in a number of ancient manuscripts that differ slightly from one another... and many errors have crept in... There is no way of knowing which versions are (exactly faithful to) the original and which are the errors. While this doesn't change its stories in any substantial manner, it does make it impossible to anchor beliefs or arguments on any given section... (4)."

Even to those who will rightfully argue that Enoch was unjustly banned, this alone is a legitimate reason to exclude it from the holy writ. When faced with the task of declaring what is and what is not the "inspired, infallible Word of God," erring on the side of caution and certainty must be the case every time! (Only those who do not believe in the divine inspiration, and modern integrity, of scripture will be dissatisfied with this reasoning.) So, while 1 Enoch is almost beyond doubt an "inspired" text, the translated copies available (presumably) in 390 A.D., and especially those we have today, could not with any certainty also be classified as "infallible."

Another less important but quite "legitimate" issue is that 1 Enoch is actually a collection of at least four different "books," possibly written by various authors over many centuries, and possibly not by the true Enoch of Genesis

The Artisan Publishers' introduction to The Book of Enoch says "there can be no shadow of doubt" that there is a diversity of authorship and perhaps even time periods represented across the span of 1 Enoch, but that there is also "nonetheless, uniformity." They attribute this to the very possible idea that as God raised up prophets (after Malachi...?), they published under the safety of a revered pseudonym, to avoid persecution and possible death at the hands of the religious powers-that-were, who wanted no "fresh words" from God (1). This could well be the case, but would make the book(s) of Enoch no less inspired of God if true. However, only the NT Book of Hebrews (written centuries closer to the Bible's assembly, with multiple matching manuscripts) has been accepted as canon with such uncertain authorship – without even a good solid guess agreed upon, that is.

Since "the real" Enoch of Genesis 5 was transported to heaven – permanently – it would be no stretch to imagine that it was also a normal experience during his lifetime. After all, the Bible says he walked with God for 300 years! (Genesis 5:22) The first 36 chapters (detailing the watchers' fall) are sometimes only reluctantly attributed to Enoch (given their pre-deluvian history), but there are varying theories regarding the rest of the book(s). For much of the 1800's, it was argued that the remaining chapters were actually the work of an early Christian scribe, but these claims were decisively put to rest with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, as were JT Milik's claims that chapters 37-71 were Christian.

Charlesworth says "The consensus communis is unparalleled in almost any other area of research; no specialist now argues that I Enoch 37-71 is (written by a first-century) Christian and (that it) postdates the first century... (2) and (5)." With this in mind, we must again face up to the very real dilemma of stating that either the entire New Testament was "drawn" in a natural, secular way from 1 Enoch – with no supernatural inspiration – or that 1 Enoch and The New Testament are both from God.

It is also considered that possibly a single author assembled older prophets' inspired works around 200 B.C. and simply added Enoch's name to them all, to ensure widespread acceptance – "Hardly a practice that inspires confidence in the text (4)." But in reality, it is no secret academically that certain canonized OT books, as well as Mark's gospel, may have been originally written by another – or even multiple – inspired author(s) and later were also assembled under the inspiration of God by a single author, who put either his own, or the original author's name, to the work. For example, most agree that Moses actually wrote Job's story from other existing texts (or that he knew him personally), before he even wrote Genesis. Most of the Major Prophets and historical books contain clear breaks in the time period, and were finally

assembled many years later – as the author “was carried along by the Holy Spirit (1 Peter 2:21).” Christians need to get over the idea that “inspiration” means the writer went into some mystical trance, while God “possessed them” and wrote the Bible. Inspiration simply means they were obedient to God’s leading, and wrote what He said OR supernaturally revealed to them, or even that he guided their research, helping them discern truth from error, for the purpose of writing “an orderly account (Luke 1:3).” Here, Luke states that his gospel was an extended research project!

In that vein, I.D.E. Thomas has recently suggested one other possibility perhaps not considered in academic circles before the 1986 publication of *The Omega Conspiracy*. “Thomas suggests that the compiler may have written his book from texts originally written by Enoch himself. In such a case it would make perfect sense for the compiler to attach Enoch’s name to the book for which he had provided the material (4) and (6).”

Even with all of this said, there is still no “clean” explanation for Enoch’s 1000-year disappearance from even popular literature though. Despite the above reasons for not canonizing the book, it is painfully apparent that the church did in fact suppress *The Book of Enoch*. Only in studying both the goals and motives – positive and negative – of the Roman Church do the truest reason for Enoch’s “fall from grace” become apparent.

(But despite the arguments presented here, please note that I have no intention of bashing the early Roman Catholic Church. Always remember, they have done the world an incredible service by assembling and preserving God’s Word for the 1600+ years yet to follow. To make a distinction, the greatest sins and travesties they often stand accused – and guilty of – were not the work or intent of the earliest Church fathers, but of the corrupt political system that grew up in the centuries after the Roman system’s formation. “It was not until hundreds of years later (5th – 7th centuries), that the first vestiges of this church government rose where there was a Roman bishop as the head of the Church, making it an official Roman Church functioning similar to today’s.” (7))

Realistically however, there was also a “point” to the canon. The goal and even eternal function in assembling the earliest Bibles was NOT merely sorting out what was inspired of God and what was not. They also had the specific intent of promoting and preserving a solid doctrinal foundation for all believers in Christ. Like Paul, they had to passionately argue against Gnosticism – “the doctrine of salvation by knowledge (8),” or the idea that gaining “superior”

and/or “hidden” knowledge ensures one some higher spiritual position – opposed to a simple obedient faith in Christ.

Arguing for 1 Enoch’s “proper place” today, one (seemingly) Gnostic apologist states “Enoch had found and experienced God face-to-face, something which Gnostics strive for. The Church opposed Gnostics... Experiencing God was taboo... Putting a stamp of approval on such a wild tale (Enoch) would have too many people believing that they could experience God for themselves, instead of going into a church and being told what to believe... Those who experienced visions or personal insights became dangerous to the church. They could lead people astray by supporting independent thought and actions (3).” It’s quite difficult to seriously consider this argument however, in light of the fact that a more common criticism of Catholicism is that they “worship,” or at least perhaps TOO highly esteem, those who have had profound mystical experiences with God! For that matter, the Bible is NOTHING BUT a collection of “those who experienced visions or personal insights.” It would quite a thin book if all such stories were left out!

The truth is that Gnostics “strive(d) for” experiencing God without knowing and submitting to Christ or His Body, the church. Even today, the wish to “experience God face-to-face” without Christ’s mediation (1 Timothy 2:5) is not just an honest effort to avoid false religion (of which there is much), but to not submit to any spiritual authority at all – whether it be God’s Church, God’s Word or even God’s Christ! It should always be kept in perspective that “the church” was not Rome’s, or even man’s idea. Jesus said “I will build my church, and the gates of hell will not prevail against it (Mt 16:18).” The early church rightly opposed Gnosticism, but beginning with Paul’s letters, not with the Roman Church. Many who passionately promote (or just reprint and sell) 1 Enoch today do so not with the intention of promoting a deeper faith in God’s inspired Word, but more with the intent of undermining the Bible’s authority – and especially the church’s. 1 Enoch’s clear historical integrity but “lack of inclusion in the Bible” is often used to “springboard” arguments for other “favorite” heretical books, left out for all the right reasons. Modern Gnostics are often fond of several other “gospels” (such as Thomas and Mary, both of which have statements and theologies that clearly contradict the more reliable works by John, Matthew, et al, proving they were NOT inspired by God). In short (oops – too late for that!), the typical Gnostic and New Age arguments have nothing to do with why The Book of Enoch was not included in the Bible, or not preserved with other ancient works. (The true “reasons why” are actually more sinister...)

The forming church also had to publicly refute and stand against (from within!) the heresy of modalism, which in part suggests that Jesus Christ is a created being – eternal nonetheless, but inferior in substance to God the Father. The Council of Nicea was expressly interested in making sure that the doctrine of the Triune Godhead was clearly expressed by the canon, and especially that it would not be misunderstood by those who would read the Scriptures. Another “motive” was to refute “Pneumatomachians – who accepted the deity of Christ but said the Holy Spirit was an impersonal force... And so it was, and we are indebted today to a 4th century Luther that stood up to define the nature of Christ and God against a flood of falsehood (8).”

To be honest, in reading Enoch there seems to be in the multitude of heavenly trips a physical distinction sometimes made between The Father and the Pre-Incarnate Son. The phrases “Lord of Spirits” , “Ancient of Days,” and “Son of Man” are used so often (perhaps interchangeably, perhaps not) that even a careful reading sometimes infers the (doctrinally acceptable – 1 Cor 15:24) separation of the eternal Godhead. On earth, “... all the fullness of the deity” was present in Jesus Christ, “the image of the invisible God.” But 1 Enoch can at minimum cause confusion to the understanding of the Godhead – hard enough to grasp even today – in a way that other authors (Moses, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Paul and John) do not when speaking of their face-to-face encounters with God. (Did any gnostics still in the audience catch that phrase?) Even without the conflicting manuscripts or possible multiple authors coming into play (which careful examination of the rest of canon shows could have been worked out actually, if they so chose), I sincerely believe that if there was a legitimate, excusable motive for not including Enoch in the Bible, this was it.

This does not excuse why we had to wait 1000 years to re-discover this book however.

So finally, with the general integrity of the Holy Scriptures, and the legitimate reasons the early Roman Catholic Church may have rejected 1 Enoch covered respectfully (and in a way palatable for modern Christian academics), let’s critically examine the real reasons behind the indisputable censure of 1 Enoch. There are many texts that – while not included as canon – have nonetheless retained their “position of honor” and even reverence among the (Western) historical Christian church. Among these are the Apocrypha (still included of course in modern Catholic Bibles – and, just FYI, even included in the original King James Bible), as well as The 12 Patriarchs, and writings too numerous to name by various “Church Fathers.” All of these have remained in a relatively high-profile position throughout church history, more or less available

for both scholars and laymen to draw from when studying the ancient origins of the Christian faith. Not so with Enoch.

Yes, ANY of the above are certainly “good enough” reasons to have disqualified Enoch from canonization. But only assuming you wanted to in the first place ...

With all of the evidence in, we have to own the fact that 1 Enoch was not merely “rejected for canonization.” It was buried. Flat out suppressed. It was quite intentionally lost to history, with all copies destroyed or left to rot 10 stories deep under the Vatican. Enoch was not merely “left out of the Bible.” It was dropped like a bad habit.

Okay, only for those who have come the distance, now let’s talk dirt...

Point blank, Origen was right. Enoch was suppressed and labeled as heresy specifically to hide the truth of the fallen angels’ past, present and future activity on earth.

Forget Roswell. Forget the X-Files. The most successful, enduring and damaging cover-up of “The Truth” about our planet’s frequent visitors – has come from within The Church.

Part 2 – The Sons of Seth Theory – The Early Catholic Church’s suppression of the truth of angelic abduction with special thanks to Pastor Chris Ward for his research of the ancient texts.

This article alleges the suppression of The Book of Enoch and the truth of angelic abductions by examining The Sons of Seth Theory, which was introduced approximately 400 A.D. Any resemblance found here to actual church leaders – living or dead – is purely a conspiracy theory.

As said in Part 1, the Church itself is responsible for perpetrating the most enduring and damaging cover-up in regard to abductions.

Beyond this, in accordance with prophecies made by Peter, Paul and Jesus Christ himself, they invented a completely false doctrine about the “proper interpretation” of Genesis 6. This heresy has robbed both the church and unchurched from any hope of understanding the truth behind abductions. In short, Jews and early Christians knew full well that angels did, could and would abduct humans for the purposes of sex and hybridization, BUT these same texts also gave safeguards against such assault.

This rogue element of the early church (sort of an early Catholic Majestic 12, if you will) has left moderns at the mercy of a phenomenon they have no hope of understanding or defending themselves against. Today's society is doomed to repeat the errors of our ancient ancestors, by once again falling prey to the Watchers' sorceries and claims of divinity. Already, far too many are under the sway of UFO cults, claiming that they are led by "spirit-guides here to help humanity." Many more "normal" individuals in the world of scientific UFO research and supposedly the world's governments merely defer to their technology, by assuming the Watchers are a superior race from the stars. Citing Ezekiel 3:18 (while I'm making enemies anyway) allow me to also charge that the blood, the wrecked lives, and the eternal damnation of all souls who have fallen victim to either abductions or deceptive philosophies is on the hands of those who perpetrated – and today with knowledge maintain – these deceptive doctrines.

I realize these are astounding and damning claims, and I would not make them without offering sufficient proof. Because of the incorrect (but widely taught in seminaries) "Sons of Seth" interpretation of Genesis 6 introduced around 400 A.D., Christians start out at a disadvantage when studying the topic. For this reason, these arguments will be offered in a way meant to challenge and convince the Christian believer of these claims. Then, we'll look over other texts which received "the Enoch treatment." As made clear elsewhere on this site, I still maintain a belief in and respect for the integrity of scripture (the original languages that is) as God's inspired word. The problem here is that God's inspired word has been intentionally misrepresented by those entrusted to teach it.

The Sons of Seth Heresy

Beginning around 400 A.D., portions of the church began to take an unusual stand against the angelic interpretation of Genesis 6. Rather than teaching what the text clearly says (especially when examined in Hebrew, below), and what had been the Orthodox Jewish and early Christian view for all time previous, the idea was introduced that this passage "really" referred to the lineages of Cain and Seth, the surviving sons of Adam. They said it simply means that the "rebellious" lines of Cain were marrying the "faithful" descendants of Seth. The unfounded presumption of this theory is that ALL of Seth's descendants were godly, while ALL of Cain's were rebellious. While a sketchy pattern can be drawn from Genesis, it is really a ridiculous injustice to the concept of free will and of God's dealing with individuals to dogmatically hold to this position. It further implies that Sethites were somehow immune to the effects of the Fall itself.

Conspiracy aside, the angelic interpretation itself rather assaults the sensibilities of even those good men throughout the ages who would be tempted to apologetically shirk from believing and teaching God's word as inerrant truth. As J Timothy Unruh says "Modern Christians have often attempted to make this passage in Genesis more palatable intellectually by explaining the 'sons of God' as Sethites and the 'daughters of men' as Cainites, with their union representing the breaking down of the wall of separation between believers and unbelievers." (9) Ultimately, this position simply does not "hold water" under even casual study. (A brief but in-depth analysis of the Sons of Seth theory is online, posted by researcher and author Chuck Missler (11). Because of this, I will only touch on the relevant points continuing from Unruh's book, published earlier and available to be read online in it's entirety.)

Those who hold to the humanistic Sethite explanation have never been able to suggest a sufficient reason (or even a lame one actually) as to why the children of one "immoral" parent would be physical giants however, IF both parents were otherwise normal humans. While the angelic abduction scenario seems more like science fiction to today's intellectual Christian, the Sethite doctrine is actually easily revealed to be the fantasy!

The exact term "sons of God" (B'nai haElohim in Hebrew) used in Genesis 6:1-4, is used also in Job 1:6, 2:1 & 38:7 always referring to angels. Unfortunately, many competent Bible scholars of today still believe the "sons of God" are of human lineage. This is simply because it has been taught in seminaries for centuries, thanks to the deceptive and radically unsound doctrinal shift introduced by the church at this point in history.

Unruh continues, "The actual expression 'sons of God' occurs explicitly three other times (in Job, above)... and in each case the term refers indisputably to angelic beings.... There are as well implicit references to these sons of God in a number of other passages. There is no doubt in these passages the meaning applies exclusively to angels... A very similar term bar elohim is used in Daniel 3:25, and refers either to an angel or a theophany (ie, an appearance of God before the incarnation in Christ). The term 'sons of the mighty' (bene elim) is used in Psalm 29:1 and also Psalm 89:6, and again refers to angels. The sons of Elohim the mighty creator are confined to those creatures made directly by the Divine hand, and not born of other beings of their own order." (9) Any amount of honest research into this topic will turn up the same findings, that someone (or some being...) from within the 3rd – 5th century church did a great violence to the literal reading of the text in concocting the Sethite theory.

Dr. Arnold Fruchtenbaum, renowned Judaic scholar and one of the foremost authorities on the nation of Israel, agrees almost verbatim with this assessment, in his work *Messianic Christology*. While many who support the Sethite doctrine argue that the ENGLISH phrase son(s) of God is referred to in the Bible as simply meaning “believers” in general, there is a world of difference between the Old and New Testament use of this term. In the New Testament sense, the term is applied to those who have become “sons of God” through their faith in Christ, but by adoption (Romans 8 ; 1 John).

Fruchtenbaum writes “The term ‘sons of God’ is a general term which means ‘to be brought into existence by God’s creative act.’ Because the term carries this meaning, it is used very selectively. Throughout the Old Testament the term ‘sons of God’ is always used of angels. But some want to make Gen 6:1-4 the one exception, and there is simply no warrant for making an exception here. In the New Testament the term ‘sons of God’ is expanded. Adam is called the son of God (Luke 3:38) because he was brought into existence by creation. Believers are called sons of God (John 1:12) because believers are considered to be a new creation (Galatians 6:15). But in Genesis, the text is dealing with a specific Hebrew expression, *benei elohim*, and, as it is used in the Hebrew Old Testament, it is a term that is always used of angels. The distinction in this passage then is not between Sethites and Cainites, but between humanity and angels.” (10)

Fruchtenbaum, Unruh, Huie, Missler and other modern authors all offer similar academic works on these subjects, all citing the same Old & New Test passages to put forth sound and extensive rebuttals to many other objections frequently offered in defense of the Sethite interpretation, or other claims of some “human lineage.” The point here though is that the Sethite theory introduced to (unleashed upon) the Christian mindset by the Church at this time clearly denies the truth of Scripture. As Missler rightly asserts “There is no basis for restricting the text to either subset of Adam’s descendants... The entire view is contrived on a series of assumptions without Scriptural support...

“The “Sons of Elohim” saw the daughters of men that they were fair and took them wives of all that they chose. It appears that the women had little say in the matter. The domineering implication hardly suggests a godly approach to the union. Even the mention that they saw that they were attractive seems out of place if only normal biology was involved. And were the daughters of Seth so unattractive? ... If the lines of Seth were so faithful, why did they perish in the flood?” (11)

Implanting these false doctrines, which survive to this day, was a long battle which some determined force from within the Church finally accomplished, and Origen and other faithful men paid the ultimate price by being labeled heretics, exiled and/or even publicly burned to initiate and execute this great “cover up.” (This tragic history is catalogued in E.C. Prophet’s *Fallen Angels & The Origins of Evil; Why Church Fathers Suppressed The Book of Enoch*, but see also my online disclaimers to her work).

This pseudo-theology eventually succeeded in becoming the official church dogma however, surviving even to today’s Bible institutions, despite the fact that the rest of the canon affirms the angelic interpretation many times over.

It is worth noting before moving on, that the Bible is far from the only ancient source that makes the argument that angels interbred with humans. The entire pantheon of Greco-Roman mythology is the same story retold, but romanticized by cultures who were deceived by these so-called “gods” who mated with human women to produce Hercules, etc. “The Book of Antiquities” (which you’ll find in the study of almost any pastor you ask) by ancient historian Flavius Josephus also tells us that angelic hybridization produced the “Titans” of Greco-Roman culture, as shown from this research posted online by Bryan T. Huie (btw... that Greek word “Titanos,” which was eventually translated from the Greek version of the Hebrew OT to give us “giant” in the King James Version, can also be translated “grey.” Just some food for thought). Josephus writes:

“...they now showed by their actions a double degree of wickedness; whereby they made God to be their enemy, for many angels* of God accompanied with women and begat sons that proved unjust, and despisers of all that was good, on account of the confidence they had in their own strength; for the tradition is, that these men did what resembled the acts of those whom the Grecians called giants. But Noah was very uneasy at what they did...”

Continuing from Huie’s webpage – * “This notion, that the fallen angels were, in some sense the fathers of the old giants, was the constant opinion of antiquity. As you can see, Josephus believed and recorded that “the sons of God” mentioned in Genesis 6 were fallen angels. As Whitson’s footnote acknowledges, this belief was standard in the ancient world.

“Another well-known first century Jewish writer, Philo of Alexandria, shared Josephus’ views on this topic. In his work “On the Giants,” Philo wrote: “And when the angels of God saw the daughters of men that they were beautiful, they took unto themselves wives of all them

whom they chose.’ Those beings, whom other philosophers call demons, Moses usually calls angels...”(The Works of Philo, “De Gigantibus,” translated by C.D. Yonge, p. 152)

“As shown above, the evidence that “the sons of God” mentioned in Genesis 6 are fallen angels is substantial. By their sexual immorality, these angels produced offspring, which were strong and violent. The concept of a race of giants which resulted from the union of gods and humans is virtually universal in the world’s early civilizations.” (12)

The “conspiracy” from within the Church quite literally changed the history of the world – both it’s past, and it’s future. Julius Africanus, St. Augustine and many others debunked and destroyed every document relating to the angelic invasion to successfully promote their “weather balloon / crash dummy” Sethite fallacy. Before long Christianity itself would eventually erode from being a dynamic, living, supernatural faith in a miracle working God to become merely “the new intellectualism,” whose seat had moved from Athens to Rome.

The errors and ungodliness of the political elite who succeeded the 1st and 2nd century church’s apostles, evangelists and martyrs are lamented elsewhere. But as this system began to promote the “mediation” of the priesthood (1 Tim 2:5), and as the doctrines of men (?) came to replace belief in the Word of God (Mark 6-8, 13), the then “Western world” spiraled downward into it’s Dark Ages. The carefully chronicled histories of the ancients became known first as mythology, then finally as Saturday morning cartoons, and our race quite simply forgot about the truth.

But it’s out there. In July 1947, about an hour outside of Roswell, New Mexico, the gods of old returned to find a basically God-fearing, Mom & apple pie loving kind of 1940’s Americana culture – but one that had also just harnessed the most destructive force the world had ever seen, and who now held the undisputed title of “world champion superpower.”

And thanks to the old church’s now forgotten “cover-up” of the truth behind fiery chariots and abductions, we’d have NO CLUE as to what had just landed in our back yard...

But God did.

On the other side of the world, among a nearly forgotten people group that was – by destiny’s clock – just seconds away from rejoining the fray of the mighty nations of the world, a

goofy little kid chased his pet sheep into a cave. And on an otherwise normal hot summer's day in 1948, he walked out with the archeological find of the millennium.

A clay jar filled with some scrolls. Among them of course, were fragments from the book of Enoch.

As a matter of course, the Vatican paid top dollar for them.

“And I heard, but I understood not: then I said, Oh my Lord, what shall be the end of these things?”

“And the angel said, Go thy way Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end.

“Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly; and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand.”

(End of the book of Daniel 12:8-10)

This article, and links for the notes and references made in this article, can be found online at www.alienresistance.org/book_of_enoch.htm

Key to notes:

(1) Artisan Publishers, The Book of Enoch (Ethiopic, Richard Laurence trans (2) Chris Ward, D Min Return of the Watchers tape and/or his Enoch page (3) The Book Tree, The Book of Enoch (Ethiopic, RH Charles trans, Preface by Paul Tice)

(4) Stephen Quayle, Aliens & Fallen Angels: The Sexual Corruption of the Human Race

(5) J.H. Charlesworth; The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha & The New Testament

(6) I.D.E. Thomas, The Omega Conspiracy

(7) “The Nicene Council,” Let Us Reason ministries

(8) New Advent's Catholic Encyclopedia

(9) The Present Day UFO-Alien Abduction Phenomenon, by J Timothy Unruh

(10) Messianic Christology by Dr. Arnold G. Fruchtenbaum Ariel Ministries (11) Mischievous Angels or Sethites, by Chuck Missler (appendix to Alien Encounters)

(12) Here A Little, There A Little website, by Bryan T Huie