

The Nephilim Theory vs. Ancient Aliens:

A Rebuttal to Jason Colavito's Attack on LA Marzulli

Sometimes truth is best expressed when contrasted with error. We even see writers in the Bible clarify the God's truth by contrasting it with erroneous belief systems. Known in theology as the "*via negativa*" (I am using this phrase here analogically not formally), it is a method for expressing truth by contrasting it with what is NOT true. It was the way the scholastics of medieval times attempted to depict God... "He is not evil; He is not capricious; He is not restricted to one locality; He is not ...". But the method also works well when attempting to clarify a difficult theological concept, or in the case of this article, to expound upon the details of what has become a very controversial teaching. Indeed, it is a fascinating subject that I, one author among many, have put forth to my readership. However, before jumping to the subject, let me complete the explanation of how the Bible uses the "*via negativa*" to explain some of its most difficult subject matter – especially those topics where the natural and the supernatural intersect.



The Apostle John began his account of the life of Christ by describing Jesus as the *Logos* – the *Word made flesh* (logos means "WORD" in Greek). John used the *logos* concept as his backdrop which had been articulated by the Jewish scholar, Philo of Alexandria (a contemporary of Jesus). Philo believed that the *Logos* was a *created* force, empowered by a creative "word" spoken by the Infinite and pure God, an "emanation" from God. God spoke and the world came into being. And this is important – the *logos* was an intermediary between the pure Almighty God and the physical creation. The *logos* was not God. He was distinguished from both God and the creation in order that the pureness of God would not be contaminated by His handling the evilness of matter. For Philo and others in the first century AD, the creation was NOT GOOD (in contrast to God's seeing that what He had made WAS GOOD). For these philosophers, the world was made from *corrupted material* – which was their best attempt to explain why *there is evil in the world*. In context, many believe that John's initial audience was to a Greek-speaking exiled

Were Spiritual Beings Ancient Aliens?

Jewish population, the *diaspora*, likely resident in North Africa and certainly throughout the Mediterranean region. That is why John (in chapter 1, verse 1) begins his account writing the particular, if not outright *peculiar* phrasing, "*In the beginning was the Word. The Word was with God and the Word was God. All things came into being through Him. Without Him nothing came into being that came into being.*" In other words: the Word was not created. The Word was God Himself – not an emanation.¹ The Word created everything. There is no intermediary that is part created, part God.

Hopefully this preface is valuable in its own right and not just a long-winded justification for my tact in this article. For I will, like the evangelist John, dwell on some highly intelligent error so that I might expound upon what I believe is a difficult but necessary truth. Admittedly – to outsiders and unbelievers – what I propose *could not sound more absurd*. Nonetheless, I contend (alongside many fellow researchers/authors in the Christian community today) that the Bible teaches a monstrously strange thing

– that fallen angels (angels who “left their first estate”, see Jude 6) begat offspring – hybrids – by mating with human women. This scandalous act gave rise to an unimaginable sort of *hybrid vigor* – the procreation of giants the Bible calls *Nephilim*. The writer of Genesis informs his readers that, “*The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterward, when the sons of God came in to the daughters of men, and they bore children to them. Those were the mighty men who were of old, men of renown.*” (Genesis 6:4, NASB)

My comrade in arms, LA Marzulli, has been pioneering this teaching for quite some time now. As a result, he encounters lots of opposition. Some of it comes from very smart persons who offer what may seem to be, at least on the surface, *intelligent* resistance. But upon painstaking analysis, which I will attempt to accomplish here, such provocateurs often bloviate atop a perch fashioned of mistaken infallibility. One such person who attempted to smack LA down recently was Jason Colavito. I caught his blog just a few days ago. His pseudo-sophisticated remarks energized me to create this rebuttal.

Without a doubt, Colavito is a smart guy. And he has every right to challenge Marzulli and the many “ancient alien theorists” in whatever way he chooses. However, when he resorts to defamation out of a false sense of intellectual superiority (while citing more than a few falsehoods), it demands a thoughtful response. This became apparent to me when his comments crossed a line and grew increasingly disparaging. He targeted LA’s critique of the television show, *Ancient Aliens* (from the History Channel). Colavito assembled a mix of some fact and much fancy, a few blatant fictions, and a lot of patronizing put downs. From his statements, it appears Colavito supposes himself well-schooled in theology and biblical studies. I will point out, along the way, that assumptions of “his schooling” are a big part of the problem.

As he routinely researches and comments on the speculations of “ancient alien theorists,” it is inevitable Jason Colavito would eventually collide with LA Marzulli. Both are outspoken. No doubt, sometime LA “fires for affect” (to use an artillery term – i.e., without much worry about exactly where his mortar shells land). But Colavito’s challenge is worthy to address because it personifies a growing sentiment amongst those who challenge Marzulli’s teaching about the Nephilim (a teaching hardly unique to LA). Therefore, Colavito’s shots at LA are really shots at the whole community of teachers (myself included) who contend what we teach about the Nephilim is the correct biblical position – that the Nephilim were hybrid humanoids that infected humankind before the flood of Noah. In other words, when asserting this doctrine, LA hardly stands alone.

Now I can’t speak with the finesse of an LA Marzulli. He can cite colorful stories, explicate the Bible with a vitality few can match, and he is the funniest evangelist I have ever heard. Admittedly, he is also a good friend. So forgive me for rushing to his defense. I do this in my own way, for what I lack in rhetoric I attempt to compensate for in polemic. Since my gifts manifest in analyses and apologetics, I join the debate from my armchair (more accurately my fully armed desktop complete with Mac laptop). Feel free to evaluate my prowess in this regard as I address Colavito’s not-so-friendly jibes at LA and the doctrine we mutually support (a troop of whom LA and I would most certainly include the illustrious Tom Horn, Cris Putnam, Steve Quayle, Gary Stearman, and a host of others). In short, it regards what I call *The Nephilim Theory*. I’ll explain why it is a theory presently. But first, for the record, Jason’s original post is located at the following link:

<http://www.jasoncolavito.com/1/post/2013/10/1-a-marzulli-blasts-ancient-aliens-for-promoting-satanism.html>

And to explain my tact: I will navigate through Colavito's post and intersperse my analysis and comments "in line" with his text, although separated by line breaks and other formatting. I think this will make for easier reading.



Allow me a few further clarifications and comments:

The first clarification is that those named above (who write about prophetic themes) have collectively concluded the bible teaches that the Nephilim of Genesis 6:4 were indeed fallen angels – the sons of God, the *bene elohim*; while their offspring were the giants – the *Nephilim*. Upon reflection, we would recognize that our position is an interpretation, or better yet – an *interpolation* – of numerous biblical passages. Now an interpolation can mean to falsify the facts. But it also can mean to establish additional values that lie between two facts, as in mathematics where one “interpolates” a value between two other known values. It is that latter sense that I use the descriptor, *interpolate*.

Secondly, it would not be incorrect to formally describe our view as a *theory*, just as *General Relativity* is still considered a *theory* – and not a fact – in the minds of some physicists.ⁱⁱ Neither model is *a priori* knowledge (i.e., *proven* without need to do investigation or testing), but instead *a posteriori* (meaning that experience or evidence gathering is required to prove it true beyond reasonable doubt).ⁱⁱⁱ That is to say, both are reasoned conclusions drawn from searching out instructive information or more plainly, *evidence*. Therefore, for convenience as well as clarification, I will refer to our teaching or position as the *Nephilim Theory*. Note: we believe it is true beyond a reasonable doubt, but we would nonetheless agree it is limited or restricted to a *reasoned conclusion* based on empirical data, biblical exposition, along with the study of ancient artifacts and historically significant (and often ancient) documents. Using yet one more analogy: it resembles the theory of why dinosaurs were destroyed 65 million years ago. Scientists theorize that the culprit was a planetary cataclysm which transpired when a comet struck the

earth near the Yucatan peninsula. They believe this event occurred because it fits the facts (the empirical data) of the geologic record. In much the same way, the Nephilim Theory makes historical accounts sensible and better explains the biblical record. We would add it also provides a plausible explanation (from an eschatological perspective) for burgeoning UFO and alien abduction incident reports by vast sources across the globe today. That aspect of the story, however, is beyond the scope of what I will address in this article.

Colavito's original is displayed in a standard font... my analysis and comments are in [brackets] with *italics* and **bolding**... *[to differentiate]*. I have added endnotes to substantiate my comments, research, and analysis, and to separate them, in an attempt to reduce interruptions and disturb the flow of the article.

Now, on to Colavito's blog and my rebuttal.

Jason Colavito wrote:

You may remember that in my review of Monday's *Ancient Aliens* I noted that there was little fallout from the show's open advocacy of Satan worship. That changed yesterday with an angry blog post by none other than L. A. Marzulli *[I will refer to him here for simplicity's sake as LAM]*, whom you will remember as the self-proclaimed explicator of Christian prophecy *[many proclaim him such – as I do]* who offered ridiculous claims *[patronizing LAM, an accusation that will be proven false]* about the Nephilim...

[Definition for clarity: Nephilim comprises two Hebrew words, usually spelled Raphaim and Nephilim, but pronounced ra-fay-ee and nah-fell, according to Strong's Concordance. Both are translated "giants". Yet, there is a connotation with Raphaim associated with death or "dying ones", and with Nephilim associated with "fallen ones"- such connotations being instructive in their own right],

...inter-dimensional demonic invasions, and the benefits of genocide at the Paradigm Symposium a couple of weeks ago. Marzulli describes himself as a Biblical literalist, but he also writes in his book *The Cosmic Chess Match* that while the Bible should be taken literally, it is (at his convenience) "in some places symbolic."

[Colavito here is stressing that LAM is inconsistent in hermeneutics (methods of interpretation), and (implies) he is misleading his audience.]

Here we have a bizarre situation where a believer in demons masquerading as aliens is openly criticizing those who believe that aliens masquerade as demons.

[I suspect Colavito is not accurately describing the ancient alien theorist's position either, but I haven't seen this episode to verify, for I don't know that ancient alien theorists believe that aliens masquerade as anything other than extraterrestrials, and these theorists don't correlate today's alien appearances with ancient alien appearances per se].

They all believe in the same literal interpretations of the same texts and yet are utterly at odds.

[Colavito asserts it is bizarre for LAM to come away with a different interpretation than the ancient alien theorists (I will refer to them as AATS for simplicity going forward) since both view ancient texts in a fashion he describes as "literalists" – although this is a problematic characterization as I will explain in a moment.]

Marzulli begins by quoting David Childress, who was one of the most eager pundits to embrace Satanism on Monday *[Please note: in fairness to Childress, there is a big distinction between Satanism and Luciferic teachings – see endnote]^v*. Childress said, “In a sense, Satan’s not such a bad guy. You can’t have light without the dark. You can’t have right without wrong. And we have to learn these things for ourselves, and ultimately, through choice wrong and right, we grow and we become who we are and ultimately to be like our makers, to be gods ourselves.” As Marzulli notes, *[rightly so, Colavito implies]* Childress is unconsciously repeating the serpent’s words in Genesis 3:5, when it tells Eve that to eat of the forbidden fruit is to “be like God, knowing good and evil.”

“...in my opinion,” Marzulli writes, “Prometheus Entertainment, the guys who produce the show, have an agenda and it was in full display in this episode.”

[Colavito continues]

He *[LAM]* is upset that *Ancient Aliens* is twisting the Bible to meet a preconceived idea—which is, of course, a bit humorous given his intent to twist the Bible *[implying that LAM’s interpretation of Genesis 6 is an intentional misleading of his audience]* into supporting the notion that the Sons of God from Genesis 6 added evil DNA to the human genome

[Clarification: the “sons of god” DNA was not necessarily evil, just different, i.e., it was angelic.]

[Colavito continues] as he told the Paradigm Symposium in identifying Peruvian elongated skulls as holding demonic DNA.

[Colavito is asserting that LAM is hypocritical in accusing AATS of twisting the Bible to support a view that Satan is a good, not evil, “guy” – because Colavito maintains that LAM twists the scripture to support his view – that fallen angels infected the human race with fallen angel DNA, i.e., fallen angels spawned the Nephilim. The notion Colavito attempts to make – either rightly or wrongly – is that any true god must have both an evil and a good side (‘aspect’) in order to be an enlightened being... which is a Luciferic premise shared with most New Age thinking. This teaching harkens to second century Gnosticism and fourth century Manichaeism^v].



Anyway, he now says *[Colavito is now quoting LAM]:*

[Marzulli:] They get it right when they point out that *The Book of Revelation* is the end of a cosmic war, but they fail to understand that it is not with ancient astronauts from other galaxies, it is between the rebel angels and the hosts of heaven. They are shoe-horning their beloved ancient astronaut theory into the text and in my opinion it doesn’t fit.

[Colavito continues] Because the aliens are really fallen angels.

[Colavito contends that LAM is foolish to contradict AATs because his alternative view is (equally) ridiculous, i.e., that aliens are fallen angels. In effect Colavito is saying that neither AATs nor LAM can critique the other because they are both arguing from a false foundation and for a

preposterous point of view – Colavito asserts his position is true a priori – that his position is obviously true, as any “thinking” person would have to admit].

[Colavito continues] Marzulli has his own issues though, beyond the open embrace of Satanism.

[A statement by Colavito that even the AATs would likely disavow – since very few members of the human race argue that the actions and worship of true Satanism is beneficial to anyone!]

[Colavito continues] He is concerned that the *Ancient Aliens* isn't giving viewers the truth about the Fallen Angels' plan to thwart the holy bloodline of Jesus...

[Actually, Nephilim theorists, if I may call our group by this awkward label, argue that sin is carried through the male “Y” chromosome, not the bloodline per se, certainly not a post-Jesus bloodline. That is why a woman can provide a 100% sin free egg – but the gamete becomes infected via the male seed].

[Colavito continues] Here's Marzulli's take: *[Colavito quoting LAM:]* “In essence the fallen angels were trying to corrupt the human G-nome [sic] and thus thwart the messianic line, and the promise of one who would crush the Serpent's—Satan's—head.” This is confusing, first because in mainstream Christianity Jesus is the son of God, not of Joseph...

[Yes, Jesus is the son of God. But it is not true that there is a distinction between mainstream Christianity aka orthodox Christianity, or “our” Christianity (those that teach about the Nephilim) in this matter – as long as it is maintained that Jesus was born of a virgin, thought by the community to be Joseph's son, but was actually the byproduct of a union of a male seed provided by the Holy Spirit with Mary's egg – which we believe is the correct, albeit audacious claim of the New Testament – speaking facetiously of course].

[Colavito continues] ... of the line of David, so I'm not sure what bloodline is supposed to be corrupted. Is Marzulli a believer in an alternative origin for Jesus? (Some believe that the one of the two conflicting genealogies...

[This amounts to a false premise that New Testament genealogies contradict each other]

[Colavito continues] ... of Jesus in Matthew 1 and Luke 3 belongs instead to Mary, but this violates the principle of literalism...

[Actually if truly in contradiction, these distinct genealogies would violate the principle of biblical infallibility – literalism is quite secondary in this context.]

[Colavito continues] Since both assert they trace the line of Jesus through Joseph).

[This is a highly, and historically debatable assertion: first, Matthew's genealogy (Matthew 1:1-1:17) traces Jesus lineage through Joseph – Jesus' legal father, the supposed father of Jesus, showing Jesus' kingship of the Jews as He qualifies as the coming son of David. He is the fulfillment of the promise to Abraham. Many scholars believe Luke's genealogy traces Jesus' lineage through Mary, and is intended to show Jesus' relationship to all humankind, not just the Jews. It connects Jesus to Adam, the first human son of god – illustrating Jesus is the new Adam and the new beginning for the human race.^{vi} Secondly, although it is not reasonable for believers to expect unbelievers to cut them any slack here, the “principle of literalism” is a colloquial, idiomatic expression not a theological one.^{vii}]

[Colavito continues] It is also confusing because Genesis makes fairly plain that the offspring of the Sons of God were the heroes of old, not the special line of direct descent from Adam to Abraham to David...

[Colavito confuses the point LAM is making: yes, the Nephilim gave rise to the mythologies of Sumer, Babylon, Egypt, and later Greece, Rome, even Norse legends. The point: there was a contiguous and

completely human bloodline from Adam through Seth, through Methuselah and then Noah, which was not contaminated with angelic DNA]

[Colavito continues] If this demon DNA causes sin...

[Once again, this is confusing the point: angel DNA, not demon^{viii} (see endnote) once introduced into humanoids, which Nephilim, i.e. giants were and, therefore, our theory, supported by various scriptures is that the human genome had been compromised] ...

[Colavito continues] ...but God saved only Noah for being righteous,

[Which we argue is not the whole story, if one reads the scripture duly sensitized to the issue. We believe that Noah, like Abraham later, believed god, and his faith was counted as righteousness. God placed Noah and his family on the ark to preserve a pure, human genome to insure the lineage of Messiah would be completely human. It is our belief Jesus' genealogy through Mary had, according to our theory, no angelic DNA tainting it.]

[Colavito continues] ...how did this demonic DNA survive the Flood that ended all life outside the Ark? Was Noah's wife a carrier? I do not recall reading that in Genesis.

[There are many things that are not covered in Genesis. The Bible doesn't intend to provide all information about everything. But concerning how corrupted DNA existed after the flood: there are two principal theories conservatives hold regarding how Nephilim DNA appears after the flood, where it appears it was predominant in the land of Canaan (notably the Amorites aka sons of Anak –Numbers 13:33; Anakims and Emims – Deuteronomy 2:11, Zamzummims – Deuteronomy 12:20). We plainly see from these passages that Canaan was chock full of Nephilim. Theory one is known as “the multiple incursion theory” – meaning that angels copulated with human women again AFTER the Flood of Noah. Theory two: the theory that corrupted DNA was present on Noah's Ark; that is, someone in Noah's family, a daughter of one of the sons, had angelic DNA and this DNA afterwards was dispersed into several lines of humanity. Given biblical history as reported post-flood, it would appear to have been through Ham and his son Canaan.^{ix}]

[Colavito continues] Obviously, this is a moot question since there is clearly no evidence that there ever was a Flood...

[Patronizing to those who believe the Bible's account, including Jesus who talked of Noah as a historical figure – see Matthew 24:37. It takes little research to establish there is a mountain of empirical geologic data, let alone linguistic data demonstrating that virtually all ancient cultures tell tales of a global flood. Therefore, I do not believe rebutting this assertion requires any documentation here, but please see the endnote^x],

[Colavito continues] ...let alone demon-hybrid humans with special sin-inducing semen

[A colorful sound-bite, but not what the Nephilim theory holds to be true. Nephilim weren't made hybrids through demons but through fallen angels].

[Colavito continues] Marzulli, instead, is rejecting the Biblical redactors' own view of the Flood, in which sin was inherent in the human condition, part and parcel of the Fall...

[This is not the “doing” of Hebrew “redactors” (which itself assumes the JEPD theory – i.e., the so-called Documentary Hypothesis), of how the Pentateuch was created, a theory which we also reject, as

we support the biblical tradition that Moses wrote the Pentateuch). We agree that sin was inherent in the human condition and was a result of humankind's fall. However, the Nephilim Theory attempts to explain the "sin nature" (see Romans chapter 7), how this sin nature impacts the genetics of humankind, and how it is transmitted from one generation to the next. It does not deny true moral guilt, as Francis Schaeffer depicted it.]

[Colavito continues] ... and is instead embracing the revisionist view of the books of Enoch and Jubilees, in which the Flood was specifically caused by the demon seed of the Sons of God producing extra-evil super-sinners...

[Nephilim were indeed extra-evil and were super-sinners... but that, in and of itself, wasn't the reason. They spread their evilness throughout all humanity, save one family. Humankind was contaminated with angelic DNA and this resulted in a higher propensity to sin based upon not just the DNA but also the teachings of the Watchers and the Nephilim – if the Book of Enoch is to be accepted as, at least partly historical. We could also question whether Enoch, Jubilees, etc., actually revised the Genesis account; or rather they merely supplemented it].

[Colavito continues] In Genesis 6:6, for example, God regrets having created humans—he does not blame his Sons for corrupting them. It is only later, in apocalyptic Judaism...

[Colavito is assuming here that these non-canonical books were created in the second or third centuries BC, they were part of a collection of apocryphal books known as "apocalyptic literature" which would usually include the book of Daniel, (we think disparagingly so). However, conservative scholarship would argue they were written much earlier than in the third century BC. Daniel, we believe, was written by Daniel in the sixth century BC just as it purports.]

[Colavito continues] ... that evil begins to be personified...

[We would disagree inasmuch as the oldest book in the bible, Job, deals extensively with the question of evil and its incarnation in Satan, apparently another son of god (as Satan or Lucifer was directly created by Yahweh) and explicitly designated as the accuser along with the sons of God who appeared before Yahweh. (Job 1:6,7)]

[Colavito continues] ...and becomes attached to the semi-divine heroes and their fathers, the Sons of God, now seen as openly rebelling against Yahweh. In Enoch, for example, the angels specifically blame only the Nephilim when making the case for the Flood to God:

[This confuses the Watchers, who were angels, with the Nephilim, who were the angels' offspring.]

“[The Watchers] have gone to the daughters of men upon the earth, and have slept with the women, and have defiled themselves, and revealed to them all kinds of sins. And the women have borne giants, and the whole earth has thereby been filled with blood and unrighteousness.” (1 Enoch 9:8-10)

[Colavito continues] ...God, accepting that “the souls of those who have died”—the good, normal humans—have petitioned for help, announces a Flood to “heal the earth which the angels have corrupted.” Specifically, God orders the Flood on order to “destroy...the children of the Watchers.” Notice that in this version God no longer regrets having made humans; he now is upset at the angels.

[Once again, Colavito is confusing the angels aka the Watchers, with the Nephilim – who were the giant offspring resulting from the unholy union between the Watchers and the daughters of men. Not

that Colavito at this point cares about being accurate – he is simply belittling those of us who believe this account to be historically truthful].

[Colavito continues] Already, just a few centuries after the composition of Genesis, humans are no longer the cause of God’s wrath (as they had also been in the earlier Mesopotamian flood stories, though for being too noisy) but innocent bystanders being saved by death from the supernatural cause of sin.

[This confusion ties back to the same misidentification of watchers with Nephilim and is not the teaching of the Old Testament – from cover to cover. Humankind is not saved by death – but saved from death – even Job reflects the uniquely monotheistic belief in the resurrection of the body, immortal, sinless, and perfected. Once again, in the Bible’s oldest book, we read “even after my skin has been destroyed yet in my flesh I shall see God.” (Job 19:26, NASB). Colavito argues from a modernist point of view, which builds upon the foundational tenet that the Pentateuch as well as “the writings and the prophets” were all written late in the biblical period (about the sixth century BC) and redacted by the priestly elite headed by (possibly) EZRA, the High Priest. Colavito assumes again, a priori, that liberal, heterodox scholarship is to be trusted and is the theological system that all thinking men like him, know to be true.]

[Colavito continues] What Marzulli is doing, though, is frankly bizarre. He seems to maintain that the Nephilim (the giants) somehow preserved their cursed DNA down to the present...

[LAM doesn’t argue this and is not attempting to reclassify sin as merely an infection of angelic DNA.]

[Colavito continues] ...he seems to be looking to quantify sin physically as demonic DNA...

[No one has argued that demons have DNA, although the discussion of the creation of alien-human hybrids might suppose that – we would argue that fallen angels’ DNA, mixed with human DNA, accounts for what is being called modern Nephilim (a “second incursion” – but this is again outside the scope of this article and a different topic albeit related).]

[Colavito continues] ...not unlike Trey Smith and his *Nephilim: Origins of Genetic Evil* video I reviewed on Monday. It seems weird to more or less displace the idea of sin from the personal to the impersonal, to make it a physical fact (your relative percentage of demon DNA) rather than a moral condition.

[This is not at all what the Nephilim theory holds. We would agree, it is a most unsettling and unpredictable idea. The percentage of demon DNA as a basis for “how sinful someone is” constitutes a strange notion indeed. On the one hand, we agree that sin is a moral condition. However, where we do offer a controversial perspective is the view that sin does have a physical manifestation, that is, in DNA. Once again, this may seem like a completely ludicrous claim because it is only recently been articulated with these words, but there are scientific and empirical reasons to believe it is true. The Chicago Symposium on DNA, hosted by Russ Dizdar in April, 2013, contains a series of lectures by a number of different speakers including myself and LAM, which discuss how sin and DNA may be “connected”.]

[Colavito continues] Marzulli finishes with a false dilemma that about sums up the entire problem with alternative history:

[Quoting LAM:] “So who are we to believe, the History Channels [sic] version or what the text actually states?”

[I might agree that in this case, LAM is begging the question, because it is our theory that this is what the text states, just as the AATs may believe that the text states what they hold to be true. The verdict ultimately has to be rendered based upon as much textual evidence, historical evidence, biblical and non-biblical research, as one can possibly muster. But I'm not sure precisely what Colavito's problem is with alternate history from his criticism here of LAM. I am also sure that LAM understands how he may have begged the question with his statement. No one's perfect! I suspect he was firing for affect!]

[Colavito concludes] Maybe the answer is that ancient texts can't be read uncritically and require a deeper understanding of their context and origins to understand what they mean...

Conclusion (Woodward Summary)

We would certainly agree with Colavito's summation that ancient texts (or most any text for that matter) should be read with one's critical faculties intact. But who is guilty of reading the texts uncritically? Colavito's accusation assumes his point of view is correct without offering any proof other than his many mostly provocative criticisms. Colavito asserts Marzulli is *reading the texts uncritically* (which is another way of saying that the reader's assumptions get in the way of rightly understanding what the author intended to say). We would counter that Colavito is just as uncritical. Colavito contends that the only critical way to read the texts is to agree with his particular set of *naturalistic* assumptions; and thereby apprehend *a better understanding of their context* – which we would argue is *exactly what the Nephilim Theory does*, perhaps for the first time since the days before Augustine (before the fifth century). That is, we believe the Nephilim Theory brings a comprehensive understanding of the “cosmic chess match” (using LA's book title) in light of compiling the biblical data about the *Raphaim* and the *Nephilim*, along with the growing record of empirical data (consisting of giant skeletons and highly deformed skulls), AND the possible connection with UFOs and alien abductions rising to the level of a tempest in this, we believe, the final chapter of human history. Our perspective has only become accepted relatively recently by a growing number of Bible students, due to Marzulli's efforts^{xi} (along with the rest of our humble band of researcher/writers), after the following issues came to the foreground during the past 20 years:

1. The dominant view of the sons of God being a “godly line of Seth” (aka the “*Sethite view*”) has been weakened by accepting the possibility that angels and humans *could* create offspring – that the Bible in fact meant to say what seemed absurd – that there could be intermarriage between the sons of God with the daughters of men. The Nephilim Theory is hardly brand new, but it had been rejected for the most part since the time of Augustine until now.
2. Extensive archeological evidence is piling up in the Americas, including LA's recent work in Peru, of giants' bones and mal-formed skulls, fossils buried amidst Neolithic and *early modern* artifacts (such as massive *copper coats of armor*) – such discoveries shaking up the standard model of humankind's history, much to the chagrin of the Smithsonian Institute.^{xii}
3. Considerable secular confirmation of alien/UFO phenomena and the demand for their explanation has become commonplace. Many Bible believers are convinced these phenomena are real and therefore, seek to reconcile these disturbing “supernatural” accounts with the Bible.

In conclusion, the reconciliation of the data from ancient documents with today's empirical findings begins by understanding these apocalyptic last days are, as Jesus said, akin to the time before the Flood.

“As the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be.” (Matthew 24:37)

* * * * *

Doug Woodward is the author of six books including: *Power Quest, Books One and Two*, as well as *The Final Babylon: America and the Coming of Antichrist*, with co-authors Douglas Krieger and Dene McGriff. His website is www.faith-happens.com. He may be reached at doug@faith-happens.com.

ENDNOTES

ⁱ Likewise, Paul challenges the confusing “gnosis” that the believers at Colossae were confronting in their surrounding culture, a gnosis that purported Jesus was not really a human being – he was a spiritual creature (much akin to Philo’s logos). However, Paul challenged the validity of the gnosis – the special or initiated truth being taught falsely to the Colossians – by expressing that the knowledge of Jesus Christ was, in effect, a super knowledge or “EPI-gnosis” that God had revealed to the Church, and more specifically through Paul’s teaching to his congregations. In summary, both John and Paul explained the incarnation, in part, by contrasting it with error. Make no mistake: this error was being propounded by very intelligent men who sounded eminently sophisticated. Nevertheless, their teachings were deathly error.

ⁱⁱ The followers of Nikola Tesla, Nikolai Kozyrev, and a number of other “alternative” physicists would argue this. See Joseph P. Farrell’s books or my book, *Power Quest, Book One: America’s Obsession with the Paranormal*, for extended discussions on this topic.

ⁱⁱⁱ Wikipedia provides a simple synopsis of the distinction between the two:

- *A priori*: Consider the proposition, "If George V reigned for at least four days, then he reigned for more than three days." This is something that one knows a priori, because it expresses a statement that one can derive by reason alone.
- *A posteriori*: Compare (with the) proposition expressed by the sentence, "George V reigned from 1910 to 1936." This is something that (if true) one must come to know a posteriori, because it expresses an empirical fact unknowable by reason alone.

For another comparison, the mathematical theory of everything model for our universe is a posteriori knowledge; but the purely mathematical manipulation of those same equations is justified a priori knowledge. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_priori_and_a_posteriori.

^{iv} **Satanism** is a blatant attempt to worship an evil entity Satan, usually through ritual, generally in which this entity is enticed to carry out some request for the worshippers, usually by torturing or killing animals or humans. LA and I are good friends with Russ Dizdar who consults with a number of police departments around the country on the topic of Satanic Ritual Abuse. **Luciferic teaching** is much more benign. It purports that illumination or knowledge important to one’s spiritual maturity comes through some manner of initiation – hidden information that only the initiated are allowed to know. It was based on the so-called Mystery Religions of ancient Pelasgians – likely forerunners to the Greeks, but possibly émigrés from Phoenicia (Canaan) to Europe, perhaps 3,000 years before Christ.

^v **Regarding the necessity of evil to exist to contrast with the good**, David Spangler, a leading New Age writer offers this bit of confirming detail: “The angel of man’s evolution will [progress us on our] journey to “godhood” at the new level, which includes a personal experience of the “knowledge of good and evil.” New Agers confirm that this knowledge is what Lucifer offered to Eve in the Garden, and it’s being offered again today. Only it’s been misunderstood, due to fear inherited from the superstitious Judaic/Christian religion. Since God has both a good and an evil side, *and one cannot attain complete godhood with only one side*, Lucifer comes to give us the final gift of wholeness. If we accept it, then he is free and we are free. That is the Luciferic initiation. It is one that many people now, and in the days ahead, will be facing, for it is an initiation into the New Age.” (From Spangler, David, *Reflections on the Christ*, p.37. Emphasis added)

Regarding Manichæism, *The Catholic Encyclopedia* offers this definition: “Manichæism is a religion founded by the Persian Mani in the latter half of the third century. It purported to be the true synthesis of all the religious systems then known, and actually consisted of Zoroastrian Dualism, Babylonian folklore, Buddhist ethics, and some small and superficial, additions of Christian elements. As the theory of two eternal principles, good and evil, is predominant in this fusion of ideas and gives color to the whole, Manichæism is classified as a form of religious Dualism. It spread with extraordinary rapidity in both East and West and maintained a sporadic and intermittent existence in the West (Africa, Spain, France, North Italy, the Balkans) for a thousand years, but it flourished mainly in the land of its birth, (Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Turkestan)

and even further East in Northern India, Western China, and Tibet, where, c. A.D. 1000, the bulk of the population professed its tenets and where it died out at an uncertain date.” See <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09591a.htm>.

^{vi} The discussion of genealogies is a challenging one and offers many lively and differing opinions. A conservative and admittedly simplified view is found in the *Ryrie Study Bible*: “Although Coniah had seven sons (perhaps adopted; cf. 1 Chron. 3:17), none occupied the throne. So, as far as a continuing dynasty was concerned, Coniah was to be considered “childless.” Although his line of descendants retained the legal throne rights, no physical descendant (no man of his descendants) would ever prosperously reign on the Davidic throne. The genealogy of Matthew traces the descent of Jesus through Solomon and Jeconiah (Heb., Coniah; Matt. 1:12); this is the genealogy of Jesus’ legal father, Joseph. Luke traces Jesus’ physical descent back through Mary and Nathan to David, bypassing Jeconiah’s line and showing accurately the fulfillment of this prophecy of Jeremiah. If Jesus had been born only in the line of Joseph (and thus of Jeconiah), He would not have been qualified to reign on the throne of David in the Millennium. See note on Matt. 1:11.” *Ryrie Study Bible*, referenced from citation

^{vii} The core issue revolves around what one means when one says, “I’m take the scripture literally, or am a literalist.” I discuss this matter in my first book, *Are We Living in the Last Days?* In essence, the intent of the statement is better conveyed by saying, “I believe the Bible is inspired by God, I take the Bible as my source for ultimate truth about the nature of God and humankind, it’s prophecies will have a fulfillment in space-time history (they are not merely allegories or symbols), and when the Bible touches subjects of history it does not make errors.” This is known as the historical-grammatical method. That means that we should seek to understand what the writer was trying to convey, what was his intent. Symbols are symbols, metaphors are metaphors. Prophecy almost always has a symbolic component; AND YET it has a “literal” fulfillment, meaning it refers to something that will have a “factual” “historical” “physical” outcome.

^{viii} Demons are usually ascribed status, not as angels or Nephilim, but as bodiless spirits or ghosts, that seek to inhabit living beings. A classic study of Demonology (often referred to by those often deal with its manifestations) is Merrill F. Unger’s book, *Demons in the World Today; a Study of Occultism in the Light of God’s Word*, Tyndale, 1971. Conservative Christianity generally follows Unger’s scholarship, seeing demons as the spirits of the Nephilim. Once these spirits departed Nephilim, they became wanderers of sorts, casting about looking for a place to “call home”. Jesus talks about them in a state that he called “dry places” – conveying a desert place, a place without life. “*But when the unclean spirit has gone out of a man, it roams through dry [arid] places in search of rest, but it does not find any.*” (Mathew 12:43)

^{ix} Rob Skiba has done extensive work in this area and should be consulted for this research. See www.robskiba.com.

^x Nevertheless, I would refer the reader to the reasonable and well-presented material at Wikipedia on the notion of the Flood Myth (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Flood_myth) without implying that the “myth” is merely a myth.

^{xi} LA would credit Dr. I.D.E. Thomas who was among the first to elaborate on this theory in his classic book, *The Omega Conspiracy: Stan’s Last Assault on God’s Kingdom*, Anomalous Publishing, 2007, 208 pages.

^{xiii} There are a number of lay persons and scientists doing “field work” in this area, including Fritz Zimmerman, Judd Burton, and Jim Vieira. Joseph P. Farrell, author of many books, has written on the subject. Steven Quayle has written extensive books and considers himself the “leading authority on Giants.”

- Zimmerman has written *The Nephilim Chronicles: Fallen Angels in the Ohio Valley*. CreateSpace, 2010, 348 pages.
- Steve Quayle, *Genesis 6 Giants*, see <http://genesis6giants.com/>.
- Vieira points out the hostility of the Smithsonian and how it has attempted to the past 100 years to confiscate all such fossils and to cover-up hundreds of newspaper articles in America documenting the discoveries of giants, with double rows of teeth and nine-foot skeletons. (See <http://www.blogtalkradio.com/bigfoottonightshow/2013/04/22/jim-vieira-giants-in-america>).
- Joseph P. Farrell, Ph.D from Oxford, has written on this topic favorably as well. See his book: *Genes, Giants Monsters, and Men*. For the record, Farrell is not an evangelical Christian nor is Vieira. Zimmerman (I believe), Quayle, and Burton are, and are acquaintances and supportive of LA Marzulli.