

BRITISH-ISRAEL CREED CONTRADICTIONS

BY

ARNOLD KENNEDY

Published by:

Christian Identity Ministries

PO Box 146

Cardwell QLD 4849

Australia

Email: hr_cim@bigpond.com

BRITISH-ISRAEL CREED CONTRADICTIONS

By: Arnold Kennedy

INTRODUCTION.

Any serious-minded person looking for answers through the various British-Israel “WE BELIEVE” statements would almost immediately identify contradictions within these statements. Consider these examples (from different sources) – the clause numbers are for reference throughout the remainder of the paper:

1. *“We believe that the Bible is a book written TO, FOR and ABOUT ISRAEL, and ISRAEL ONLY. Other races/peoples are mentioned only as they come into contact with, or affect, Israel in some way. In short the Bible is our God’s word to his people Israel, and Israel only”.*
2. *“The Bible is the record of a Divine Plan for the restoration of the world to the Sovereign Rule of God. At the centre of that plan there is the Divine Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and, as the point of contact between God and the human race we have a Divinely Chosen People”.*
3. *“We believe The Resurrection and personal return of our Lord Jesus Christ to reign over Israel”.*

In (1), above we find a very precise limiting of the Bible’s application to Israel only, whereas in (2) we find the inclusion of “the world”, which in their wrong view, means the “human race” as a whole. In (2) we can also see one claim about “*the restoration of the world to the Sovereign rule of God*”, and then a reversed claim in (3) to “*to rule over Israel*”, (only).

In such statements of belief we can see contradictions, and as we look further into these contradictions, we will see that the primary error comes from trying to merge the national message of the Bible with traditional religious beliefs, (which introduces the idea of internationalism). In looking into such contradictions, there is no intent to deny the primary meaning of what the term “British-Israel” means. It is the additions and religious overlay that are denied because Scripture does not support these. There is obviously an attempt being made by some British-Israel leadership, and some of their writers, to try to marry up what might be termed “The Exclusiveness of Israel”, with traditional religious-universalism. These leaders have the idea that God’s purpose for Israel is “to save the world”. Nationalistic and the internationalist views are in direct conflict, and they arise primarily because of the wrong view that is taken of phrases such as “all men” which is made to mean “all mankind in general”, rather than “all men of the context” in which it is found. The same applies to the phrase, “the world”, where which “world” referred to should be determined by the underlying Greek word and the context. This translation-context approach will stand any grammatical or language-usage test, whereas the religious-traditional view creates contradictions throughout the Bible.

A FURTHER LOOK INTO BRITISH-ISRAEL CREED-STATEMENTS.

Given the importance of the accuracy of such statements, consider the following examples:

- (4a) *WE BELIEVE that in the matter of personal salvation there is no distinction of race. All races are dependent upon the saving grace of the Lord Jesus.*
- (4b) *WE BELIEVE in the Gospel of Grace (Eph. 2:18). which is the Gospel of Salvation to all men.*

The most obvious comment to make is that it does not matter what this or that group believes. The real issue is what does the Bible say?

These statements immediately contradict (1) above, about the Bible being “*Our God’s word to His people Israel and Israel only*”.- The presentation about “no distinction of race” in (4a) contradicts the “separate people” as presented in other creed-points. So to try to overcome this, most British-Israelites turn “salvation” into two vague issues, namely “personal salvation” for all races and “national salvation” for Israel or Israelites.

So let us consider the phrases, “*the gospel of grace*” and the “*gospel of salvation*” which are presented in (4b) above. These are presented as being for “all men”, a phrase used by them in the international context, rather than in the national context, which is biblical. There is only one reference (in Eph. 1:13), out of 101 occurrences of

“gospel” in Scripture, to “*the gospel of your salvation*”, and only one reference (in Acts 20:24) referring to the ‘gospel of Grace’ – (“*to testify the gospel of the grace of God*”). This does not provide strong support for their claim, and it gives even less support when Paul is seen to be addressing people who are “*men of Israel*”. When Paul was taken to Rome he said he had, “*committed nothing against the people, or customs of our fathers*” (Acts 28:17) which is not a statement a lawyer would make unless he could defend it.

(5a) WE BELIEVE John 3:16, "For God so loved the world that He gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life."

(5b) We BELIEVE that personal salvation by faith in the atonement of Jesus Christ is necessary for all, Israelite, Jew and Gentile. (Rom. 3:2225). Each one must be born again. (John 3:17). To confess Christ, who died that sinful men might live, is individually supreme above all else. (Matt 10:3233. (Rom. 10:913).

(5c) Jesus.....Saviour of all those of mankind who are willing to accept His death as substitutionary for their deserved end, and, for love of Him, have his law written in their hearts and lives.

Here we find further expression in the words “*whosoever*” and “*mankind*” of the universalist, “all men” belief-aspect, which is held by most denominations, including Roman Catholics, Mormons, and Jehovah Witnesses. To hold this belief puts British-Israelites in the same camp as these cults. The problem stems from all translators of all the versions of the Bible who, being unable to comprehend the underlying explicit Greek expressions, have opted for wishy-washy vagaries instead. It is major errors in word-meanings or word applications, which cause the wrong view to arise in the first place. There are no specific references in Scripture to God loving any people other than Israel, but there are many direct references about God loving Israel. The meanings that are placed upon the words, “Israel”, “Jew”, “Gentile” by British Israelites and others are a major source of confusion to everyone, including themselves. Once again, the problem stems from failure by the translators to comprehend the underlying Greek. And failure by the British Israel creed writers to quote the text correctly heaps confusion upon confusion.

The creed-statements (5a+5b+5c) deny the exclusive nature of Israel, which is inherent in the very term “British-Israel”. Furthermore, when we see the word “atonement” in (5b), we should note that the words “reconciliation” and “atonement” (Strongs 2643 and 2644), come from exactly the same root. This “reconciliation”, or being restored to favour, can only be applied to Israel, since ‘reconciliation’ implies that these people had been in favour with God at some time in the past, but have fallen out of that relationship. These words are about the settlement of a difference between the two parties concerned, i.e. between God and Israel.

In Deut.14:2 we read, “*For thou art an holy people unto the LORD thy God, and the LORD hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth*”. How dare anyone presume they can put Israel and everybody else in the same category as each other, when God has stated precisely the opposite. Note that the above verse is a racial statement, and there are many such racial statements! No other races were in Israel’s elect position at any time and therefore “reconciliation” can never be applied to races other than Israel. In the pattern given in the Old Testament, reconciliation is in the context of Israel only (see Ezek. 45:17, “*to make reconciliation for the house of Israel*”), and in the New Testament, Hebrews 2:17, says, “*Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people*”, i.e. Israel in context. We can confirm “Israel” because “the brethren” who are reconciled are people of the same kin (*adelphos* = kinsman of the womb), and thus we must take note that the High Priest’s office was, and is still, only for Israelites. In the other Scriptures given in (5a), (5b) and (5c) above, Jesus was speaking to Israelites only. Check that for yourself – it is not that difficult!

In (5b) it is claimed that, “*Israelite, Jew and Gentile must be born again*”. This is a classic example of changing and adding to the Word of God. The statement is an utter impossibility since the Greek tense of “born again” is simply not Future tense as religious tradition claims. We must note that it is the translators who presented this passage as “*Except a man be born again*”, whereas the Greek says, “*Except a man may have been begotten from above*” where “*from above*” refers to the mechanism of their past conception, not a future impossibility. Children are “begotten” by men and are later “born” of women. No one can be “begotten” after he is “born”. The Scriptures insist that God is the father of Israel; that He begat them, and so unless a person is begotten from the line of God’s children, he cannot come to “see” the Kingdom of God. It was Nicodemus who used the word “again” (= *deuteros* = “a second time”), not Jesus. Jesus berated Nicodemus for his lack of understanding and He used the word “*another*” (= “from above”), an expression which refers to the ‘rock’ from which Israel was hewn, that is, Abraham-(Please see

Isaiah 51:1).

In (5c) it is presumed in the British-Israelite creed-statements that all races can have, “*His law written in their hearts and lives*”, but this is sentimental rather than biblical. And again, it is a mis-application of Scripture because the fact is, none of us have the law written on our hearts and none of us will, until the Kingdom is established on Earth in the Millennium. This idea is probably taken from Romans 2:14, “*For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts*”, but it is again a presumption to declare that these ‘Gentiles’ were not Israelites. The translators’ use of “Gentile” corrupts and confuses the issue. In both Hebrew and Greek, the word translated as “Gentiles” means “nations” and is used of Israel as well as other nations. Thus where the context is Israel, the application is also to Israel. If any person has any doubts about this, please consider 1 Cor.10:1-4, and then ask how these “Gentiles” could be other than descendants of Israelite “fathers”. Like most others, British-Israelites tend to ignore the difference between the Judean nation (erroneously called Jews) and the dispersed 12 tribes of Israel (the Greeks) in Asia Minor. The latter are often referred to as “Gentiles” which is the English transliteration of the Latin translation of the Greek word *ethnos* which means “nations”. (‘Gentiles’ is also used for translating the Greek word, *hellene* which means “Greek”.) Quite clearly *ethnos* (nations) and *Hellene* (Greek) have very different meanings, but they can both be used when referring to Israelites in the first 100 years after the crucifixion.

So coming back to direct references in the Bible about God’s law being “written in their hearts”, there are no references to such writing being upon the hearts of other than Israelites.

Heb 8:10 “*For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people:*”

(This is quoted from Jeremiah 31:33.) In the Greek text, “a people” here is *laos* = “*people, people, group, tribe, nation, who are of the same stock and language*”. This verse is yet another racial statement. (You will find the Bible is full of them, but the churches cannot accept what the Bible says.) In extending atonement and reconciliation to include all races, the errant British-Israelites have brought traditional corruptions into their creed statements and have created confusion in their own ranks. As Hebrews 8:10 is exclusive to “the House of Israel”, British-Israelites have ignored this context in both Testaments – to ignore it once may be an unfortunate oversight, but to ignore it twice is a deliberate action.

The “Bill of Divorcement” God gave to the House of Israel, is partly what the redemption and restoration is about. The great price Jesus paid was related to that event. The “husband” had to die, “*that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God*”-[Romans 7:4]. The fact that God divorced the House of Israel only, confuses some people as to why the House of Judah was treated differently, but that aside, the point is that no other race was subject to a divorce.

(6) “WE BELIEVE that the descendants of Jacob, grandson of Abraham, are a distinct and separate people from those who call themselves Jews today”.

It would seem that they also must mean “distinct and separate” from all other races too. If there is “*no distinction of race*”, as some British-Israel creed-statements say, how could there be any “distinct and separate people” of any kind? What this statement is rightly inferring is that the descendants of Jacob are Israelites, whereas the Jews are not. This is absolutely correct – the Pharisees testified to it themselves in John 8:33. The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* makes the claim, “*Modern Jewry is Edom*”, that the modern Jews are descended from Esau rather than through the seed of Jacob, and thus those who call themselves Jews are not Israelites. Remember also that a *Jew* is someone who follows Judaism and Judaism is a religion, not a race.

(7) “WE BELIEVE in, and seek to make known, the Gospel of the Kingdom (Matt. 4:23, 4:14)”.

Having mentioned “*the gospel of grace*” and “*the gospel of salvation*”, this mention of “*the gospel of the Kingdom*” is the third “gospel” in the British-Israel creed-statements. The creed writers do not understand these terms. When we consider Acts 1:6, “*When they therefore were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?*”, we can understand easily that this is speaking about a physical kingdom. This kingdom has to have a King, subjects, land, and laws, in order to be a kingdom. It is referring to the Kingdom of God over Israel! How can the kingdom be restored to any other race?

Those who believe the “repent” part of the statement *‘Repent, in the Kingdom of God is at hand’* tend to believe it refers to a physical Kingdom, whereas those who do not associate repentance with the Law of God tend to say that the Kingdom is spiritual. Common sense says it cannot be both – the real question is which one do you think it is and why?

(8) “WE BELIEVE in God the God of the Bible. (Exodus 3:414).

This is potentially another rather vague statement, but at least they give us a reference point. In verse 6 of this passage we find the definition of God’s scope of interest:

V6 Moreover he said, I am **the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.**

V7 And the LORD said, I have surely seen the affliction of **my people** which *are* in Egypt,

V9 Now therefore, behold, the cry of **the children of Israel** is come unto me:

V10 Come now therefore, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people **the children of Israel** out of Egypt.

V13 And Moses said unto God, Behold, *when* I come unto **the children of Israel**, and shall say unto them, **The God of your fathers** hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What *is* his name? what shall I say unto them?

V14 And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto **the children of Israel**, I AM hath sent me unto you.

The God of the Bible here, as elsewhere, is the *“the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob”*, not the God of all races. In V7 and V10 we find certain people described as *“My people”*, (i.e. Israel), so no others come into this. In V10 and V14 the people concerned are *“the Children of Israel”*.

From mentions of “all races”, “all men” in other British-Israel “we believe” passages, it is obvious that some British Israelites cannot actually believe in *“the God of the Bible”* as they claim. One of the names of the God of the Bible is found in Exodus 3:15 *“Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, The LORD God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: **this is my name for ever**, and this is my memorial unto all generations”*. The “God of the Bible” is not presented anywhere as the God of all races as claimed in items (4a), (4b), (5a) and (5b) above, and (9) below.

(9) “WE BELIEVE that Jesus, the Messiah or the Christ, is God the Son, the second person of the Trinity, and that He took our human nature upon Him in order that He might become the Redeemer and the only Saviour of mankind”.

What do British-Israelites mean by the term *“mankind”* in *“Saviour of mankind”* and of *“our”* as in *“our human nature”*? Are they really every race? The use of the word “mankind” again suggests the humanistic “brotherhood of man” doctrine, which is not found in Scripture. The generalised use of the word “mankind” ignores every verse that has carefully made such distinctions from Genesis to Revelation.

Under the Law, only a kinsman can redeem the debt of another. Hence only Israelites could be “bought back” or redeemed, and in Scripture, Jesus is the Redeemer of “all men” of Israel only. No other peoples could be “bought back” since they were never kinsmen of Abraham-Isaac-Jacob line.. People of all races may be “kept safe” by keeping the Law of God, but no race other than Israel qualifies for the redemption provided by Jesus because they are His kinsmen of the womb – His blood brothers. (Yet another Biblically racist fact. Oh dear !).

(10). WE BELIEVE that the personal visible return of the Lord Jesus in power and great glory, as part of God's great plan for the restoration of ALL CREATION to a state of harmony with His gracious will - is imminent.

About this personal “visible return” we read in 1 John 3:2, *“Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is”*. Those then who will *“see Him as He is”* only concerns *“the sons of God”*. Likewise in Rev. 1:7, where the expression is found, it concerns “the kindreds” = *phule* (or tribes) of Israel.

The verses about *“great glory”* in Matthew 24:30 and Luke 21:27 are concerned with the gathering of the “elect” only. By definition, this can apply only to the kinsmen of the Redeemer.

The “restoration of all things” (= *apokatastasis*) concerns rectifying the sin of Adam. “All creation” in Romans 8:21 again concerns only the “children of God”, and is about the “redemption of the body”, this being the hope of Israel. The context refers to only those who are “children of God”, that is, Israel. The erroneous “adoption” pertains to Israel only as we read in Romans 9:4, “*Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption* (correctly: ‘placing as sons’)”. All the “placing as sons” verses concern only Israel-(See Rom.8:15-23, Rom.9:4, Galatians 4:5 and Ephesians 3:5).

(11) WE BELIEVE that the Bible contains God's Plan for the remedy of all human ills, and that this plan is being worked out through the Bible people called Israel. (2 Sam. 7; Deut 32:8).

It is impossible to find anything outside of the context of Israel in either of the passages quoted in this creed-statement. Both passages concern God’s separation of Israel from other races and the appointment of a new place for Israel. In one passage we find, “*And what one nation in the earth is like thy people, even like Israel, whom God went to redeem for a people to himself*”, which stands in direct contrast to the error of the “all races” concept. As usual, God is the Redeemer of Israel, and Israel only throughout Scripture.

This creed-statement is a further expression of the wrong British-Israel belief that God’s purpose in choosing Israel is to “save the world”, thus making all races one with Israel.

The most common and most obvious way the churches and some British-Israelites try to skip around this chestnut is to say that Israel is to be the *nucleus* of the kingdom and that everyone else can then join them. But here again there is the problem of the lack of Scriptural support. Each and every “proof” is a man-made inference rather than a clear-cut Biblical statement. But at the end of the day, it is a question of belief and you have to answer that question yourself.

“*To redeem a people* (singular) *for Himself*” shows what God’s purpose really is. It confines redemption to only one people. As the word “Israel” contains the meaning of “prevailing or ruling with God”, the remedying of the ills of other races comes from God, through Israel, ruling over them, not through assimilation. There are many prophecies about other races coming to be servants to Israel-(e.g. Isaiah 14:1-2) and the basis is race, not belief.

(12) WE BELIEVE the Bible to be the inspired and true Word of God. WE BELIEVE the whole Bible, both the Old and New Testaments; that it is the inerrant Word of God (2 Peter 1:9-21). We believe its history, its covenants, its promises.

When talking about the Bible and, “*its history, its covenants, its promises*”, British-Israelites have to admit that these all relate only to Israel in the Old Testament, so where did other races fit in? The “great and precious promises” and the history and promises made to “the fathers” continue into the New Testament. When we read the quoted New Testament verses in 2 Peter 1:9-21, about “*For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*”, the context strictly is that of the Old Testament prophets. So where do the other races fit in? When talking about covenants and promises, we can see the covenants and promises made exclusively to Israel are applied by the British-Israel creeds to any one of any race that “believes in Jesus”. Is that not adding to God’s word?

HOW DID THESE CONTRADICTIONS ARISE?

There is no suggestion that those setting forth the creed statements are not sincere, but sincerity is not the issue here. When we examine the reasons for the contradictions, we can see that attempts were made to marry traditional doctrines and interpretations into the overall picture, and we can see from the brief comments made above, that all the creed-statements, other than the first one, are not only contradictory, but are rather simplistic as well. It is misinterpretation of a few key verses that gives the appearance of having valid reasons for including universalistic views.

The fundamental source of the errors is the English translations. In the case of the AV, the biggest problem was caused by the explicitly stated plan that the translation would use as many words as possible from the English language so that no-one could accuse them of discriminating against any word or group of words. The next significant source of error is that all the main English translations and most of the lesser-known ones were funded by religious organisations. Which religious body is going to translate itself out of existence by writing what the Greek text actually says? But it does not end there. The biggest difficulty of all was that the Anglo-Saxon translators, being descendants of Israel, could feel the inherent tug of the truth in what they were translating. But

because Israel was nationally blind to its own identity, they could not understand how they could be a part of this wonderful book that seemed to be directed at Israelites rather than Englishmen. So they resorted to vagaries and uncertainties and generalisations because it helped them feel that they could somehow participate themselves. A tragic case of reverse discrimination, brought on by their own and the nation's ignorance. And the end result are the seriously flawed creed-statements we saw in (2)-(12), above., and in the literature they spawned.

For example, an article in the New Zealand *The Covenant Report* Vol 9, No.4, presents the idea that Jesus and His disciples had differing commissions. In view of Matthew 15:24, where Jesus said, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel", it is claimed (rightly) that Jesus' commission was to Israel only. "The House of Israel" can hardly be interpreted as "all races". However, as Mark 16:15 states "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature", it is wrongly claimed that this means that Israel's commission was "to the wide world". That is, that Jesus had a different mission from that of the disciples. Yet, the article goes on to say that Jesus' sacrifice was "for the sin of the world". The British-Israel creeds states: "At the center of that Plan, there is the Divine Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and as the point of contact between God and the human race, we have a Divinely Chosen People".

It is unfortunate for this two-commission theory, that in Matthew 10:6 Jesus said to His disciples, "But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel". This indicates that there was no difference at all between the two commissions. Furthermore, Jesus told His disciples, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you". The reason for supposing there were two differing commissions is the assumption that "all the world" means "all of every race", rather than "all the *kosmos* (system or order) of Israel".

The appendixes to this paper will examine a number of such common errors created by the translators of the English versions. This does not mean we have to become Greek scholars in order to find out what God said, but it does mean we need to be far more critical of what we read so we can enquire of others (people and books) to find out what was said.

WHERE DO WE FIND 'ISRAEL' TODAY?

This note is added for those having no background about the "identity" of Israel in the modern world. Three quotes from Jewish sources may help those who have been led to believe that the word "Jews" always relates to Israelites, and who might be wondering where the Jews belong in the overall scheme.

1. From Alfred M. Lilienthal's book "What Price Israel". "Here's a paradox: an anthropological fact, many Christians have more Hebrew-Israelite blood in their veins than their Jewish neighbours".
2. The Jewish author Yair Davidy in his book "The Tribes-Israelite Origins of Western peoples" [Foreword by Rabbi A. Field] tells in much detail that *the Saxon folks are Israel*.
3. Jewish author Harry Golden wrote in 1967, "Isaiah the prophet wrote that the remnant of Yabweb's people would be found in the Islands of the sea".

These Islands can be shown as being North and West of Palestine, i.e. the United Kingdom. The British Isles have been settled predominately by the Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, and Nordic people as distinct from the white Japhethic, Ishmaelite and Edomite peoples [Genesis 9:27 and 16:12], and the obvious foreigners, who have moved into Britain over the years. Essentially they are what we refer today as being "Caucasian", that is, they originated from Caucasia where the House of Israel went into captivity. From thence their prophesied migration Westward can be traced historically through Europe, into Britain.

As Israel is the "chosen" race, then all the others must be "not chosen" for God's purpose. Reference is often made to "God's chosen people or race", suggesting wrongly that "The Jews" equates to all of Israel. Despite the popular suggestion, Scripture does not indicate that "The Jews" (The Judeans) are Israel. **Judaism has been a multi-racial religion since the days following the Babylonian captivity!** "The Jews" are not a singular race and they readily admit it themselves! The Encyclopaedia Judaica declares that "Modern Jewry is Edom", thus the Jews confirm that the descendants of Esau mainly represent modern Jewry. And, Jesus always condemned "The Jews" for what they were [See John chapter eight]. The Jews" [plural and as a popular term] cannot be Israel! Jesus said these people (the Judean leaders) could not hear the Word of God, and that it was not given unto them to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven-[Matt.13:11]! The terms "Jew" and "Jews", refers to the Edomite dominated people of the Judean nation that existed from the time following the Babylonian captivity until 135 AD. These terms are never applicable to the House of Judah. The terms "Greek" and "Greeks" refer to the dispersed 12 tribes of the House of Israel located in Asia Minor in the period after the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities until approximately 100 AD. Paul's phrase, "And so shall all Israel be saved" refers to the former two kingdoms, the House of Israel (the Northern Kingdom) and the House of Judah (the Southern Kingdom). Both houses, despite

their different captivities are both saved by Jesus' sacrifice. At the time Paul was speaking, it applied to the Israelites in the Judean nation (descendants of the 60,000 who returned to rebuild the Temple) as well as the Israelites of the Dispersion in Asia Minor.

Rom. 11.26 *And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness **from Jacob**: For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins.*

There is no suggestion anywhere in Scripture about turning ungodliness from, or the making of such a covenant, with any other peoples than Israel.

END NOTE.

Some excerpts and the appendixes in this paper are taken from "*The Exclusiveness of Israel*" which provides considerable details on these subjects. Copies are available via email from aekennedy@xtra.co.nz. This paper does not address God's purpose in choosing a special people for Himself, or how the other races relate to this purpose. For information on this topic, please see "*Is Israel A Chosen Race To Save The World*" which is also available on e-mail at aekennedy@xtra.co.nz.

The statement given below is a simple, clear statement that could replace most of the statements in the existing British-Israel statements of belief.

"We believe that the Bible is a book written TO, FOR and ABOUT ISRAEL, and ISRAEL ONLY. Other races/peoples are mentioned only as they come into contact with, or affect, Israel in some way. In short the Bible is the God of Israel's word to His people Israel, and Israel only".

The Bible also records the struggle between God and every adversary, person, group or situation that would seek to pollute or to destroy that one race.

APPENDIXES.

ARE "ALL", "EVERY", "WHO-SO-EVER", ETC. LIMITED EXPRESSIONS?

In other words, do words such as "all" usually mean "all of everything" or "all of that part being spoken about only"? Does "*all the world*" mean the entire planet, or just all of that part of the planet being spoken about? A look through Young's Analytical Concordance will show how these words are used. This will give an indication without having to go into the Greek. Being certain on this topic is well worth the time involved researching lexicons to specify the real meanings of the words used. The words for "*all*", "*every*" etc. are often singular, NOT plural. Thus they refer to:

"all" the one [group],

or "the whole" of the class,

or "the entire" of the class.

To grasp the use of "*all*" in Greek and Hebrew, consider Deut 28:10: "*And all the peoples of the earth shall see that thou art called by the name of Jehovah, and they shall be afraid of you*". Here, "*all the peoples of the earth*" does NOT include Israel in the "all". In the same way, "*go ye into all the world*" is NOT inclusive of every race. Failure to understand this is the source of error in the popular teaching of most denominations.

Jesus says that it is not given for everyone to hear or to understand Him. Speaking to His disciples about the Edomite leadership of the Judean nation, He said, "*Because it is given unto you to understand the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given*"-[Matt.13:11]. Immediately we have just one exception like this, then "every" and "all" cannot include that exception, or the other exceptions. If an exception is made about the Edomites who cannot find repentance, or of those tares about which Jesus said, "*Leave them alone*", then these cannot be part of the "all" being addressed. Speaking of the blind leaders of the blind, Jesus gave His disciples an imperative "*Let them alone*" also. Jesus had just made a plain statement, "*Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up*". Thus we have exclusions from the "all", that is, "all" is not all-inclusive. Jesus did not preach to certain peoples, as we have seen. Jesus said He was sent to Israel and to save "*His people*" from their sins. Are we to be wiser than Jesus?

When we consider the volume of Scriptures detailing the exclusiveness of Israel, if we had no mind-set or previous pre-conditioning, we would have to agree to the following:

1. They are all consistent statements of fact, [not inferences].
2. They all relate to Israel alone, as a race, no other race being included.

3. Israel alone is God's inheritance.
4. There is no conflict about redemption applying to Israel alone.
5. That certain covenants and promises referred to were made only with Israel.
6. That Israel is a holy, i.e. *set-apart*, race -[What is commonly called 'The Chosen Race'].
7. That the Statutes [*chog*] and the Judgements [*mishpat*] were given to Israel alone as a servant nation.
8. That the word "Jews" is not mentioned in any of these Scriptures.
9. That there are different "seed", and that Abraham's seed is a descendency.
10. That none of these Scriptures can be 'spiritualised'.

If we come to this conclusion about a unique Israel racially, there will immediately be a dilemma between:

[a] What the Scripture teaches in direct statements showing the exclusiveness of Israel through both Testaments.

[b] What is inferred from indirect verses as used by universalists. Universalists may use what appear to be direct statements, but there are certain words that have been given new meanings and tenses. Sometimes completely wrong and deceptive meanings have been placed on words and some of these have become accepted modern teachings. To these manufactured word meanings, "types" are added to fit the interpretation. This is the common way of teaching, but this is not teaching that is based upon the Cornerstone or the given foundation of the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets.

[c] What we think we see manifest in terms of Christian experience in other races. Both psychology and deliverance from demonic activity, and protection whilst amongst Israel have application here. But, redemption can only apply to Israel.

Consider again these two verses:

John 3:16 *God so loved the world ...*
Mark 16:15 *Go ye into all the world ...*

Such verses are the basis of the thought that the *go and preach the gospel to every creature* of Mark 16:15 refers to going to every person of every race on earth. Let us consider some of the words in these verses.

[a] Preach or *kerusso* means to proclaim, or to announce good news like a town crier. It does not mean "to make disciples" or "to evangelise", as many teach.

[b] But where were they to make their proclamations? Was it to everyone of every race? Let us look at *every creature*. The Greek word *ktisis* is given by: *Strong G2936-7 as original formation, building, creature, and ordinance.*

Vine's Dictionary of New Testament Words: ktizo is used among the Greeks to mean the foundation of a place, a city, or a colony ... It is a significant confirmation of Rom 1:20,21 that in all non-Christian Greek literature these words (*ktizo* and its derivatives) are never used by Greeks to convey the idea of a Creator or of a creative act by any of their gods. The words are confined by them to the acts of human beings.

This is the *creature* [or rather, *creation*] of Mark 16:15. The word *ktisis* in the Greek is used to indicate the product of human building or formation. In this context it refers to a village, or place where people live. A *ktisis* is built by man, not God. The disciples were to go specifically to the places or the villages or places where the Israelites lived.

Matt 10:23 *Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, til the Son of Man be come.*

We cannot make *the cities of Israel* mean the cities of every race. Note here that Jesus is speaking of the time of the end.

What is the area of proclamation?

Is it not all the world of Israel?

What were they proclaiming?

Was it not the Gospel of the Kingdom?

The Kingdom is what Jesus and John the Baptist came proclaiming *repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand*. Who proclaims that today? It is impossible to believe and teach both the modern universal gospel to all races and the exclusive Kingdom of Heaven at the same time. Jesus confines *all the world* to the cities of Israel! In other words, it is to be proclaimed in the dwellings or places where the Israelites live right up to the end of the age.

SO WHICH WORLD DID GOD "SO LOVE"?

Does all mankind belong to that "world"?

Do only certain men belong to that "world"?

Who are those people then that God loves?

Where do they come from?

These are very important questions, which have to be answered and faced up to, like it or not. A very solid foundation can be established from both Testaments to build upon, and this shows the world of an exceedingly exclusive, chosen, called, predestined and elect race of people. Most people have some thought about the existence of a “chosen people”, and somehow they come up with the label “The Jews” for these people. “The Jews” is a generalisation, which cannot equate to Israel! And, Jesus always condemned “The Jews” for what they were [John 8], so “The Jews” [as the popular term] cannot be Israel!

Over the years, accumulated errors in translations have led us away from the meanings contained in the original texts. One consequence has been that the commentaries and reference dictionaries often perpetuate and magnify the problems by using statements such as, *this has come to mean*, and then applying their own interpretations based upon such new meanings. Apart from errors in pure translation, there are errors due to words being added in English that are not supported in the original text. Also there are words deleted from the English text that are supported in the original text. An example of this is the frequent omission of the Definite Article from the English translations, where this is included in the Greek and vice versa.

Universalists may use what appear to be direct statements. But they rely on certain words that have been given new meanings. Sometimes completely wrong and deceptive meanings have been placed on words and some of these have become accepted modern teachings. To these manufactured word meanings, “types” are added to fit the interpretation. This is the common way of teaching, but it is not teaching that is based upon the given foundation of the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets.

In the New Testament there is a call to separation, which few will deny. In today’s preaching, this is presented primarily as a separation from uncleanness and sin. This is not an incorrect presentation in itself, but it is a half-truth.

2 Cor 6:16,17 ? I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be MY PEOPLE. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean [thing], and I will receive you.

The addition of “thing” [*akathartou*, genitive, singular, neuter] at the end of this verse is grammatically justified. But, preachers use it in the sense of things rather than people. When we look at this verse, it is obvious that “them” signifies the separation of one people [not thing] from other peoples.. The word used in Greek is *aphorizo* that means *to border off ... to limit off ... to separate and to sever from the rest*. In the next verse below we see how this word is used; it is used of the separation of sheep or goats. [Note: *nations* is a neuter noun whereas *them* is masculine and thus refers to the people within the nations].

Matt 25:32 And before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: ...

This specifically mentions nations. Any such suggestion of election or national separation horrifies some Christians because of the conflict between this and their understanding of *God so loved the world* and similar Scriptures. We all need to be aware that there is not a suggestion that the “seed of the serpent” could become ‘converted’, in the same way one of the Potter’s vessels made for destruction, could never become a vessel unto honour after being fired in the Potter’s oven. So it might be well to immediately look at these verses and see what *the world* means. When God separated Israel from ‘other people’ -[Lev. 20:24], there is never a suggestion that this was for a limited time.

GO INTO ALL ‘THE WORLD’, AND “WHAT DOES ‘THE WORLD’ MEAN”?

*John 3:16,17 For God so loved **the world** that he gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into **the world** to condemn **the world**; but that **the world** through him might be saved.*

*Mark 16:15 And he said unto them, Go into all **the world**, and preach the gospel to every creature.*

These are two much quoted verses. In each case “the world” is the same word *kosmos* in the original Greek. *Kosmos* is probably one of the least understood and misused words in the New Testament and perhaps we should take a short-cut and make statements about *kosmos* which is usually translated as “world”.

- [a] It does not mean every race or the inhabited earth [*oikoumene*]. Nor does it mean the land-mass of the earth or its soil [*ge* and *ghay*].
- [b] Its prime meaning is “order”, “arrangement” or “beauty”, but never the common multi-racial meaning as

taught.

- [c] It often means that particular world which is being spoken about, to the exclusion of other “worlds”. In English we speak of the “world of music” - in Greek we would say the *kosmos of music*.
- [d] *Kosmos* can mean the whole world of wicked and reprobate men as opposed to the “world” of God’s elect.
- [e] *Kosmos* is used of the Roman Empire [John 8:23].
- [f] *Kosmos* is used of the world that was before the flood [2 Peter 2:5]. That is world was destroyed [Heb 11:7].
- [g] *Kosmos* is spoken of, not only as the world that now is, but also of that which is to come. [Do we preach to the world to come?].
- [h] It can refer to things other than people, for example, the adornment of a woman’s hair [see 1 Tim 2:9 where *kosmos* is translated as “modest”]. It is particularly difficult to proclaim the gospel to a woman’s hair clip!
- [i] *Kosmos* is used of many other things and these can include either order or disorder, fame and honour, the orderly universe, the stars in the universe and even heaven!

So, which “world” of all these “worlds” did God *so love*? From the Scriptures, we can see that there are differing kinds of “worlds”. Think about this and how this relates to what we see written in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets. In the Old Testament we are told that God loved Israel. There does not seem to be a single direct reference to God loving any other race. Let us consider the Israel order that God says He loved in the Old Testament.

Deut 7:8 But because the Lord loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he swore unto your fathers ... [that is, of Israel].

Psalms 47:4 The excellency of Jacob whom he loved.

Isaiah 63:7-9 I will mention the loving kindness of the Lord ... and the great goodness toward the house of Israel ... in his love and in his pity he redeemed them ...

Hosea 3:1 ... according to the love of the Lord towards the children of Israel.

Hosea 11:1-4 When Israel was a child, then I loved him ... I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love: ?

Zeph 3:17 The Lord thy God in the midst of thee [that is, Israel] is mighty, he will save, he will rejoice over thee with joy, he will rest in his love ?

Malachi 1:2 Yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau, ?

In the Old Testament we have these expressions of the Israel people that God *so loved*. There are many Scriptures in the New Testament, which show the exclusive nature of Israel. Both Testaments tell of the love of God for Israel in a way, which separates them from the other races. Are we now to believe that this people Israel have somehow disappeared, despite prophecy to the contrary? If God said that He hated Esau, then Edom could not be included in the “all” or “the world” of *Go ye into all the world* and *God so loved the world*.

Just in case anyone still has reservations about “the world” having different meanings, we will look at pairs of verses each of which contain the words “the world”.

Pair One:

John 7:7 The world cannot hate you, but me it hateth.

1 John 3:13 Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hate you.

If both of these two “worlds” were the same, then the disciples could not be hated by a world that was not able to hate them. Both worlds are *kosmos*.

Pair Two:

John 17:6 I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world ?

John 17:14 ? they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.

In one verse they are out of “the world” and in the second they are not of “the world”.

Pair Three:

John 17:9 ? I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me, for they are thine.

Might it not be blasphemy to suggest that Jesus would not pray for that world He loved? So He must pray for one “world” and not for another!

THE WORLD – “KOSMOS” OR “OIKOUMENE”?

These two words are both translated “world”, but they are different in application and meaning. The meaning of *kosmos* is determined by its context to identify which particular world is under discussion, whereas *oikoumene* means the inhabited or civilised earth, such as that of the Mediterranean region of that time. We can see *oikoumene* easily in verses such as Luke 2:1 where Caesar was to tax *all the world* and Acts 11:28 about a famine throughout *all the world*. In Acts 17:6 we read where the disciples *turned the world upside down*. In Acts 19:27 we read about *all Asia and the world worshipping the goddess Diana* and in Acts 24:5 about Paul being said to be *a mover of sedition throughout the world*. In Rev 3:10 Jesus speaks about the *hour of temptation which shall come upon all the world*. In Romans 10:18 we are told the Word of God went *into all the earth* and *unto the ends of the world*. When we remember that both parts of Israel were scattered among the nations this is easily understood. We might say that the *kosmos* of Israel was scattered throughout the *oikoumene*. Jesus came into the *oikoumene* [Heb 1:6] to minister to the *kosmos* of Israel.

Once we understand this, we can correct verses which the universalists use, such as 1 John 2:2: *And He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for [that is, the sins of] the whole world*. Here the word for “world” is *kosmos*, not *oikoumene*. The “whole” is *holos*, which means every bit and every whit of the *kosmos* it refers to. The context shows John is saying that the propitiation applies to all of Israel.

It also helps with Matt 24:14 where Jesus speaks about the gospel being *preached* (proclaimed) *in all the world*. Here we find *oikoumene* for “world”, not *kosmos*. The expression *in the world* is not *to the world*. Here Jesus was addressing Israelite disciples about the gospel being a witness to all the Israel nations who were dispersed in the *oikoumene* at that time. This still applies.

DOES GOD LOVE THOSE HE DECLARES THAT HE HATES?

The Bible tells us of God’s hatred as well as God’s love. So if God hated even one man, He would not *so love the world*, as this verse is wrongly taken. God does say “*Esau have I hated*” in both Testaments. If God hated just Esau, then Edom could not be included in the “all” of *Go ye into all the world* or “the world” of *God so loved the world*. If God failed to save all mankind, then He is not almighty and unchangeable. He must be powerless if *The World* means all mankind. All men are not saved. Could the death of Jesus and the redemptive Love of God ever be in vain?

Quoting from R.K. and R.N. Phillips in “The Book of Revelation”, Part Two:

For those who are firmly convinced that the one who was crucified is Gentle Jesus, meek and mild, please note that He is capable of hate. The Greek word is miseo, to hate, regard with ill-will, to detest, to abhor. This puts the followers of the Nicolaitanes in the same category as Esau [whom God hated before he was born]. If deeds have nothing to do with resurrection, why does Jesus make such a statement about the deeds of the Nicolaitanes? If all men are equal before God, why did God hate Esau before he was born?

God’s love of the Elect is in no way limited. He so loved this “world” of His Elect. This is the order of Israel He loved and sent His Son to redeem. This is for whom Jesus died. We are told He came “*to save HIS PEOPLE from their sins*”.

Scripture says, *Whosoever believeth on Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life*. We have to look at which “world” is being addressed and see that the “whosoever” refers to “all” of that part being spoken about and not “all” of everything. The context here is Israel. The *whosoever* is a mistranslation; it literally means *the entire one*, which refers to the entire nation of Israel, as determined by the context.

Now we can go back to the Old Testament Scriptures with understanding and see just why it is so important to note all the Scriptures, which show that the Law and the Ten Commandment were given to Israel alone. It is vital to understand this. Redeeming Love can only mean redemption from the curse of a broken Law. This Law-Covenant had not been made with all races. Israel is the world Jesus came to save. He *bought back* or redeemed Israel. That redemption price, by Law, could be paid only by a kinsman - according to the Law God

gave Israel. Hence Jesus is the kinsman of Israel (He is David's greater son). Jesus is not the kinsman of any other race.

JOHN CHAPTER THREE

Let us go back to John 3 where Jesus was talking to Nicodemus, a Master of Israel. In context, Israel is the "world" they were talking about. Consider, "*For God so loved the world*"; the word "for" refers to the immediate, preceding discussion. This provides the context. To whom is Jesus speaking? This tells us which *kosmos* is under discussion. The whole subject matter concerns Israelites and a master in Israel, Nicodemus.

v3 They have to be "begotten from above" [not *born again* as translated] to be able to perceive [in their mind's eye] the Kingdom.

v5,7 Unless this spirit is inherited FROM CONCEPTION, none can enter the Kingdom [1 John 3:9].

v8 Those who are thus born of the Spirit (Israelites) respond to the call of the Spirit.

v14,15 And even as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up.

To which race did Moses lift up that serpent? Which race was then healed and cleansed from the serpent bites? It was only Israel.

Mark 16:15 is about the disciples going into all the *kosmos* and "preaching" [that is, proclaiming] the gospel to every creature. Which "world" were the disciples to go into? This is a fair question. When the disciples were sent to the *lost sheep of the House OF ISRAEL*, to whom and to which "world" were they sent? When Jesus said in Matthew 15:24: *I am not sent BUT unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel*, to what race was He sent? Are we to say Jesus was wrong and that He was sent to every race? Are we to say Jesus was wrong in sending His disciples only to Israelites? If they were told *go ye into all the world*, why did they not go to the Negroes, the Chinese or the Indians? Why did they choose only one direction and proceeded to where the Children of Israel were? The location of the House of Israel at that time can be easily established historically.

Matt 11:1 He departed thence to preach in their [disciples'] cities.

Matt 10:5-7 Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach (proclaim), saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand.

The disciples were instructed specifically not to go to certain peoples. The disciples of Jesus went out from Galilee knowing exactly where to find these "lost" sheep. They were not so "lost" that they could not be found! "Lost" has to do with God's people being set aside for Law transgression.

THE TWO MOST MISAPPLIED VERSES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

One Scripture is said to be THE MOST LOVED Scripture in the Bible. The other is said to be THE MOST MOTIVATING Scripture in the Bible.

These are the two verses:

*John 3:16-17 "For God so loved **the world** that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life. For God sent not His Son into **the world** to condemn **the world**, but that **the world** through Him might be saved".*

*Mark 16:15 "And He said unto them, Go into all **the world**, and preach the gospel to every creature".*

[The words, "the world" are emphasised because they are critical].

Why should it be said that these are the two most misapplied verses in the New Testament? Why could we even call them troublesome? It is because they cut across the flow of all Scripture, and are used today to try to over-ride racial-origin differences presented in the Holy writ right back as far as Genesis 3:15, "*And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed*". God placed this enmity there and there is no record anywhere of it

being removed. Jesus reminds us of a similar action by God in the matter of the tares and the wheat, one of which cannot turn into the other. Paul asks who man thinks he is to question God, “*Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour*” with the one “*fitted for destruction*” and the other, “*asore prepared for glory*”. Paul confirms about election in the words, “*neither having done any good or evil that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth*”. The verses John 3:16 and Mark 16:15 and others like it are used to question God. But if God had removed the enmity between the parties in Genesis 3:15, Paul would not have had to tell us about God saying, “*I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy*”. The idea that “all peoples are God’s people” and that God’s grace over-rides everything else is not Biblical.

All the verses like “*Only the LORD had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and he chose their seed after them, even you above all people, as it is this day*”-[Deut.10:15], and “*For thou didst separate them from among all the people of the earth, to be thine inheritance*”-[1 Kings 8:52], show detail within them that excludes any possibility of the multi-racial gospel as presented today. This separation continues up to and into the New Jerusalem.

It might seem to the pre-conditioned mind that it is impossible to mistranslate and impossible to misapply John 3:16 and Mark 16:15. To even suggest that there might be a problem in these two verses would upset many people because of years of pre-conditioning.

THE TWO VIEWS TAKEN OF “THE WORLD” ARE TWO DIFFERING GOSPELS.

The two views commonly taken are really two separate gospels. Only one is the gospel of the Kingdom of God over Israel. One of them then must be “*another gospel*”, and those who believe “*another gospel*”, the Apostle Paul states, are accursed!

Gal 1:8 “But, though we, or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed”.

This is really very heavy, so to not be accursed we have to look well at both gospels! Both cannot be right. One is the *gospel of the universal*. One is the *gospel of the particular*. So think this through well. Either God loves all men, [including those God says that He hates and the “*seed of the serpent*”], or He loves only His elect as the Bible confirms.

The Bible contains God’s message to His people, both to His nation and to the individuals in this nation. This is both the promise of personal redemption and the Kingdom of Heaven. Jesus commanded His disciples, “*As ye go preach, saying The kingdom of Heaven is at hand*”. Jesus and John the Baptist both started their ministries with the same message. Jesus finished with the same subject to the same people. In Acts chapter one when Jesus was asked, “*Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the Kingdom to Israel?*” He did not deny this. This message was unchanged and the Kingdom will yet be restored to Israel. [Refer to the parable of the vineyard and others]. To “restore” does not mean transfer it to a spiritual kingdom!

In popular evangelism the message has been changed from the “*Gospel of the Kingdom*” to “*the Gospel of Salvation to all races*”. What popular evangelism has done is to take the first bracket of scriptures listed at the beginning of this paper and then elevated these to become doctrine. It has not been seen that the first bracket cannot fit into the second bracket in the way the first bracket is commonly taken to mean. Then there is great effort made to try to say there is a *spiritual Israel* which they term “the Church” and a *natural Israel* which they term “The Jews”. Then they labour to try to make everything else fit this concept. But, as Paul puts it:

Rom. 15:8 Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, TO CONFIRM THE PROMISES MADE UNTO THE FATHERS.

There is not a breath of prophecy to the contrary! Neither can there be contrary fulfilment! The promises were made to none others than the descendants of “the fathers”. These “Gentiles” had the “fathers” Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and thus could only be Israelites. Likewise the “Gentiles” in 1 Cor. 10:1 about which we read, “*how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea*”, could not possibly be other than Israelites. Jesus even called the Galilean Israelites “Gentiles” in Matthew 4:15. The word “*ethnos*” which is so often translated as “Gentiles” refers to any group of people of a common origin, the separation being according to each context. It is often translated as “nations” or “peoples”.

There are no separate streams of prophecy for both “Jews and Gentiles” in the popular concept, but there are for

“The House of Judah” and for “The House of Israel”, as well as for prophecy for Israel as a whole. Every objection that can be made against the exclusiveness of Israel can easily be met on the foundation of the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets, and this is confirmed, by Jesus and the Apostles.

This all leaves Christendom with two differing gospels, only one of which is consistent through all scripture. The reader has to admit that only one of these can be the true gospel, and then consider whether or not what is commonly preached so often today is right or wrong in application. These two gospels are tabled for comparison below.

GOSPEL NUMBER ONE [The false Gospel]

This is that gospel which cannot be found throughout the Law, The Psalms, the Prophets, or through the New Testament. So, it must be false. It says in effect:

- 1.The Law and The Ten Commandments were given to every race, as a covenant.
- 2.Jesus gave His Life so that He becomes the Redeemer of all races, to redeem them from the curse of that broken law, even if the other races did not have that covenant-law relationship.
- 3.God loves all men and every individual member of all the human races, including those God says that he hates.
- 4.The gospel is for all sinners of every race, [not "*the sinners of My people*"-Amos 9:10 or *for the transgression of my people was he stricken* -Is.53:8].
- 5.All are called. There are no Tares or Goats, despite what Jesus says to the contrary.
- 6.All are chosen. There are no inferior vessels, despite what Paul says to the contrary.
- 7.There are no Twelve Tribes of Israel any more -[Even if they are found through the N.T.].
- 8.All men are supposed to have faith. -[The Bible says "*All men have not faith*".]
- 9.The Father gave Jesus to "*all men*" of all races, not "*all men*" of Israel.
- 10.All races are pre-destined with opportunity for salvation-[God must have been wrong to expect Israel to destroy certain mixed races. All are the same now it is suggested].
- 11.There are no elect people, nor any election according to grace.
- 12.God has mercy on everyone, not just on whom He chooses or elects.
- 13.There are no scriptural differences between men of differing origins.
- 14.That "men" and "mankind" always includes women as well.
- 15.That non-Israel races can be "adopted" into Israel, ignoring, "*Who are Israelites to whom pertaineth the adoption*"-[Rom.9:4] and "*of whom concerning the flesh Christ came*".
- 16.God may be worshipped acceptably within any culture and religion; all being paths to God.
- 17.All races are the same in God's sight.
- 18.It is now up to all sinners of all races to embrace the love of God or to not embrace it. It is up to everyone of every race to either have eternal life, or to perish.

I.E.-THIS GOSPEL IS FALSE BECAUSE IT SAYS IT IS MANKIND, IN GENERAL, THAT IS SOVEREIGN, AND MAKES THE CHOICES. This would mean God is not sovereign in establishing a covenant relationship with Israel. About this false gospel we read in Galatians 1:9, "*If any preach any other gospel unto you than you have received, let him be accursed*".

GOSPEL NUMBER TWO -[The True Gospel].

This is the everlasting gospel, the true gospel in which we stand, if we continue in "*The Faith*" that was once delivered unto the saints. "Saints" are defined in the Bible as Israel, God's elect, and the Gospel was delivered to no one else. The true Gospel says:

1. The Bible does not say anywhere that God loves all mankind, but only the 'world' of His elect nation. Election is established before having done good or evil.
2. Jesus came for those chosen from before the "*foundation of the world*"-(Ten New Testament references).
3. Jesus is the Shepherd of the sheep only. He said, "*I lay down my life for the sheep*"-[John 10:15]. He did not add "*for the goats and everyone else as well*".
4. Jesus prayed for "*them which Thou gavest Me*", not everyone else as well-(John 17:9)..
5. Jesus came to save His People from their sins. They were already His people before they were saved. The gospel is for "*the transgressions of my people*"-[Is.53:8].
6. It is the gospel of grace...."*And I will be gracious to whom I will*..."-(Rom.9:18). God does the choosing.
7. The gift is given only to the elect, through regeneration and efficacious calling of God.
8. Jesus is the Redeemer of Israel [both Houses only].

I.E. -THE TRUE GOSPEL SAYS THAT GOD IS ABSOLUTELY SOVEREIGN AND PARTICULAR!

