

THE SOCIAL GOSPEL - OR THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM

By

Arnold Kennedy

Published by:

Christian Identity Ministries

PO Box 146

Cardwell QLD 4849

Australia

Email: hr_cim@bigpond.com

THE SOCIAL GOSPEL - OR THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM

By: Arnold Kennedy

What is the social gospel? How is this different to the “Gospel of the Kingdom of God”? What is this Social Gospel which sounds good, looks good and what to the natural mind it is what every good Christian ought to be engaged in? To be engaged in social good works is said to be “*doing what Jesus would have done*” or to be “*following His example*”. We are encouraged to “enter into other peoples’ worlds” and to do the sort of things that Mother Theresa did. [Do not forget that Mother Theresa says that all religions are ways to God and that God does not give her as our example]. But, is this Social Gospel following Jesus’ example in fact? We will look aspects of giving, as Christians, and things relating to differences between the Two Gospels.

WHAT WAS THE PATTERN JESUS FOLLOWED?

To get some idea we need to read through the gospels and take note of how Jesus “went about” ministering primarily through the land of Galilee and also in the land of Judea where He went at specific times for specific purposes.

Matt. 4:23 *And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and **preaching the gospel of the kingdom**, and healing all manner of sickness [disability] and all manner of disease [debility] among the people.*

Matt 9:35 *And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and **preaching the gospel of the kingdom**, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people.
But, when He saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion on them, because they fainted, and were scattered abroad, as sheep having no shepherd.*

Acts 10:38 *How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and power: who went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him.*

Note the phrase, “The Gospel of the Kingdom”.

WHAT WAS THE PATTERN OF THE DISCIPLES AND APOSTLES?

Matt. 10:7-10 *As ye go preach **saying, the kingdom of heaven is at hand**, heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils; freely as ye have received freely give. Provide neither gold nor silver, nor brass in your purses.*

Luke 9:6 *And they departed, and went through the towns, **preaching the gospel**, and healing everywhere.*

Acts 8:4 *Therefore they that were scattered abroad went everywhere, **preaching the word**. Then Phillip went down to the city of Samaria, and **preached** Christ unto them. And the people with one accord gave heed to those things which Phillip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did. For unclean spirits, crying with a loud voice, came out of many [not all] that were possessed with them, and taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed.*

Acts 8:40 *And, passing through **he preached** in all the cities.*

Acts 11:19 *Now they that were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen travelled as far as Phenice,, and Cyprus, and Antioch, **preaching the word**....*

Note the ‘preach’ words and what was proclaimed.

DID JESUS TEACH OR PRACTICE THE SOCIAL GOSPEL?

Well now, we have not seen any sign of the social gospel so far. But, you say, Jesus fed the hungry. Well, yes He did. He took the lunch from an individual and fed a multitude with it! If we want to “*do what Jesus would have done*” in a situation, or if we want to “*follow His example*”, we have something to model ourselves upon!!

We see Jesus meeting needs by the power of God at an infirmary [Bethesda] and the mentally ill [Gadara], together with the disabled, the sick, the blind, the broken hearted, those imprisoned by their passions, etc,

But to convert people:

Do we see Jesus feeding poor individuals?	No.
Do we see Jesus clothing poor individuals?	No.
Do we see Jesus giving any money to the poor?	No.
Do we see Jesus having anything equivalent to garage sales?	No.
Do we see Jesus spending repeat time with needy people?	No.
Do we see Jesus having social activities for the crippled?	No.
Do we see Jesus supporting solo mothers?	No.
Do we see Jesus looking after refugees?	No.
Did Jesus campaign for Human rights?	No.
Did Jesus stimulate the quest for peace and social justice?	No.
Did Jesus seek for disarmament?	No.
Did Jesus campaign for prisoners of conscience?	No.
Did Jesus seek to eliminate racial and sexual discrimination?	<u>No.</u>
TOTAL SOCIAL GOSPEL.....	<u>Nil.</u>

We have to conclude then that these things were not His ministry and so doing these things is not following His example or doing what we seem to think that He would have done. When Jesus was moved with compassion, the above were not His method of meeting the needs. This means that the concept of the social gospel is flawed. We will come back to the "poor" later. Certain of them are not to be neglected as God's people, but there is a sequence in Scripture in dealing with believers and their need.

THE SUPPOSED SOCIAL GOSPEL IN THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

Generalities are taught in the Churches suggesting that Christians should be kind "to those less fortunate than we are" and in that this includes the criminals, degenerate people, the unrepentant, people who are not our 'brothers', and that we should forgive everyone 'seventy times seven'. By "loving everyone" and "recompensing to no man evil for evil" this is supposed to include all of mankind and every one of every race. It is supposed to include God's enemies, Communists, radicals and every sort of stirrer and agitator.

To create the Social Gospel, the specifics of Jesus' words and the qualifications that Jesus gave have to be ignored. In every case, Jesus gave a context or a condition. Where we are told, "*Love your neighbour as yourselves*" this is turned to suggest that a neighbour is anyone anywhere in need. But the word for neighbour [*plesion*] is used as an adverb and is neuter and refers to one's own neighbour, not someone else's neighbour. It is used in the sense of one's own village, or one's own kind or land. When Jesus used the word 'neighbour' He associates this with the commandments which were given as a covenant to Israel only-[Matt 19:17-19]. So "your neighbour" here is an Israelite. In the story of the Good Samaritan, we read about a "certain man", 'certain' being a word that is definitive.

All the instructions in the Sermon on the Mount are addressed to Israelite disciples, and this includes "love your enemies" where these are within Israel. Where Jesus says, "*For if ye forgive men their trespasses*" in Matthew the context is qualified or limited by "thy brother". Luke put it this way, "*If thy brother trespass against thee...*". "Brother or *adelphos* refers to the same kin. There is no 'brotherhood of man' found in the Bible. There is the condition given, namely, "*If he repent, forgive him*". If we want further proof, we are told, "*If he will not hear thee, tell it to the Church*". "*If he will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican*". Again there are certain conditions. There would be no point to tell the Church about a non-member. If we want further definition of 'brother', Jesus says it is he that "*doeth the will of My Father in Heaven*"-[Matt. 12:48-50 and Mark 3:33-35]. There is absolutely no universal Social Gospel in the Bible.

THE PROCLAMATION OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

But, what do we see about proclaiming the Kingdom in the verses above? The first thing done by Jesus and the Apostles did was to teach and preach [which means *make a proclamation*]. What was this proclamation? It was the "*gospel of The Kingdom of God*". This came first before saying anything else or doing anything else. So we have to know what the Kingdom is if we are to proclaim it.

WHAT IS THE KINGDOM?

We see from Matt.8:12 that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are seen to be the front line guests. Isaac and Jacob (as a genetic/racial lineage) had promises confirmed to them that had been made to Abraham. Here we see that *many shall come from the East and the West* who will sit down with these fathers of Israel. [They are not the fathers of anyone else in the sense of these being '*childrens children*']. This is about the re-gathering of Israel that is so much prophecy about and it never includes anyone else. As Paul said, "*The promises made*

to the fathers are confirmed to us their children". This is a racial statement! So they are not confirmed to anyone else! No other party or race had such promises made to them or such prophecy made about them.

At Sinai the Children of Israel accepted God as their King, thus making them a 'holy nation'. Peter addresses the same 'holy nation' in his epistles. God has never rejected that Sovereignty over that throne or that nation. In His parables Jesus spoke about the wicked men who were then occupying the vineyard [a territory] and that when the King returned He would miserably destroy them. The vineyard as a 'field' is an area within the earth; it is not all the earth, nor is it a spiritual vineyard. This 'holy nation' was to be the next step in the re-establishment of the Sovereignty of the Kingdom of God on the Earth. This Sovereignty of God denotes a sphere of God's rule and authority, and as a Kingdom it requires that:

1. It has a territory;
2. It has a people;
3. It has laws;
4. It has a King;
5. It has an economy;
6. It has an administration.

Each of these can be identified in Scripture. Jesus proclaimed this sovereignty! If every race was included then this would all be meaningless. A number of commentaries refer to the redemption being spoken of as being that of the same people who had once been redeemed from Egypt. The Exodus is the first place where there is mention of redemption-[Exodus 15:13]. The redemption in Scripture is always that of Israel, and of Israel only. The issue of the redemption of Israel is stated before the Covenant of the Law.

The physical throne over Israel where David and Solomon sat is described as "The Throne of the Lord" -[1 Chron.29:23 and Jer.3:17] and the context only involves The House of Israel and the House of Judah. This thus is not a Kingdom made up on a belief basis only.

WHAT SHOULD WE DO ABOUT THIS?

NO ONE STARTS WITH A PROCLAMATION ABOUT THE KINGDOM TODAY! Jesus had said to the disciples, "*Behold I give you authority*". The racial isolation of Israel is not liked today so scripture is changed to try to say that the promises are made to everyone else. So how could we expect God to honour something that was not true? In the Bible, Jesus is always presented as the King of ISRAEL. [It was the Romans who described Him as the King of the Jews (The Judean nation was racially mixed)]. **Now, if we are to follow Jesus' example, why not start at the same point as Jesus, the disciples and the apostles started at?** Not only did Jesus start at this point, He finished at the same subject as we see in Acts chapter one where He was asked, "*Lord, wilt thou at this time restore THE KINGDOM to Israel*"? The disciples had the timing wrong, but that is all; but, they had heard what the message was. They must have heard it so often from the Master. And note that "restore" does not indicate a spiritual kingdom.

What followed the proclamation of the Kingdom?

Mark 16:20 And they went forth [same word as 'went about' as above], and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word, with signs following.

This is what we see in the verses quoted earlier. The proclamation was followed by the healing which was a confirmation of what had been proclaimed. Again, it is a sequence. Unless we are prepared to start at the beginning we will never make any progress. If we start with the social gospel we are starting at the wrong place and God will not honour this as we would not be honouring Him and believing His Word. No, the belief about Jesus and His Kingdom comes first. In Mark 16 we are told about making a proclamation and then about "*he that believeth and is baptised*"

Mark 16:15 And these signs shall follow them that believe; in my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover.

In John 4:48 there were those who wanted things the other way around, just like today and Jesus told them, "*Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe*".

Now, the disciples and apostles understood the proclamation of the Kingdom and thus were able to pray in the will of God by saying:

*Acts 4:30 And now Lord, behold their threatenings; and grant to thy servants, that with all boldness they might **speak thy word**, and by stretching forth thine hand to heal; signs and wonders may be done in the name of thy holy child Jesus. And when they had prayed, the place was shaken...*

Here again is the same sequence. Earlier in the chapter, they had “*preached through Jesus, the resurrection from the dead*”, the resurrection being the time of coming into the inheritance which is the Kingdom of Heaven. It is through Jesus’ death and resurrection that His people are redeemed to become children of the resurrection who will inherit the Kingdom of Heaven. Why say “His people”?

Matt 1:21 And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call him Jesus: for he shall save HIS PEOPLE from their sins.

Israel is God’s people before they are saved. No other race had the Old Covenant and so no other race can have the New Covenant.[–see Jer 31:31 and Heb. 8:8]. Note: *thou shalt call his name Jesus*, not call Him by the title ‘Christ’ as most do today. [‘Christ’ is sometimes a verbal adjective]. But, let us get back to the Social Gospel.

HUMANITARIAN ACTIVITY.

Today we have all sorts of social organisations, some professing Christian, some not. Humanitarian activity is not disparaged, but again Scripture has a sequence and specific application. We have seen above a number of things that totalled ‘nil’ that Jesus, the disciples and apostles did not do. In other words, nothing done out of order will bring any one of God’s people [or anyone else if that were possible] to a knowledge of redemption. Sentimentality is “good works”. We cannot know the power of God by “good works”. The initial thing in God’s method is always the proclamation of the Kingdom of Heaven over Israel, followed by meeting sickness and spiritual needs by Kingdom authority. Humanitarian organisations are not geared to this order, and thus might be said to be ‘out of order’. For instance, World Vision and World Government work hand in hand in a common purpose, even if World Government is anti-evangelical-Christianity. Does that not tell us anything? Scripture points out something else in Mark 14:11 where the giving of money was made by the Edomite Judean leadership as a bribe to Judas to betray Jesus. Jesus did not give money and the disciples were to go out taking no money with them. Social organisations and some Church organisations could also be betraying and denying Jesus where they are doing this. In effect, they are “*denying the power of God*” and must be turned from and avoided (*apotrepto*)-[2 Tim.3:5].

THE ‘POOR’ IN SCRIPTURE.

[The Greek word indicates that the ‘poor-ness’ of the poor is publicly visible]. In the Word of God we find things about ‘the poor’ such as that *we should remember the poor*. James makes an issue of this. So, we might as well start with the Book of James. At the beginning of this book we find that it is written to a specific group, namely *The Twelve Tribes*. “The poor” here [as widows are] are thus within this specific group. So we cannot bend this. When Jesus spoke those words, *blessed are the poor in spirit*, in the Sermon on the Mount He was addressing his Israelite disciples. He went on to say,

Matt. 5:3 “for theirs is the kingdom of heaven”.

This mention of the Kingdom started really early in the piece, with Jesus and John the Baptist.

Mark 1:15 Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, the time is at hand, repent ye, and believe the gospel.

Matt. 3:1-2 In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in Judea, repent ye for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.

‘The gospel’ is described as “*The gospel of the Kingdom of God*”. This is not what we hear today; we seldom hear in public or in private any gospel of any kind, right or wrong. When we do what we hear is “another Gospel”, and Paul said that to preach ‘another gospel’ is to be anathema and accursed!

Next Jesus is recorded as saying, “*The poor have the gospel preached [proclaimed] to them* -Matt.11:5. He does not say *have hand-outs so that we can win them or be a witness to people*. In Matt. 26:11 Jesus pointed out, “*For ye have the poor always with you*”. Jesus again was speaking to his Israelite disciples about the poor that were among them.

When Jesus quoted Isaiah in Luke 4:8 He said, “*because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor*”. If we wanted to change this order to “feed the hungry of all the earth” and all the rest of the social gospel we would be teaching and doing something other than what Jesus said.

But there is a time to call the poor to a feast; it is an instruction in fact. This is amongst God’s people. This parable tells about a wedding that the poor and the lame and the blind should be invited to. This wedding is connected to the resurrection of the just -[Luke 14:14 + 21], and this connects with the Kingdom of Heaven over Israel.

After Zacchaeus repented he said, “*Half my goods I give to the poor*” and so on. He had robbed Israelites in taxation and was reimbursing Israelites. Jesus said to Zacchaeus

Luke 19:9 *"This day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham. For the Son of man is come to seek and save that which was lost."*

Zacchaeus had agreed to keep the statutes and precepts part of the Law of God, showing repentance. This is the only time Jesus used the word "salvation". Christians use the words "saved" and "salvation" frequently and usually wrongly. This is a matter of social conformity and pre-conditioning. Zacchaeus had been "lost" or *apollumi* which is about Israelites who were "set aside for judgement" for having broken the Law Covenant. "The lost" thus cannot refer to other than Israelites. The Good Shepherd went looking for the lost sheep [Israel always] and not goats or anyone else. 'Sheep' represents Israelites in the Bible.

COLLECTIONS FOR THE POOR.

When the Apostle Paul took a collection from Macedonia it was for the "poor saints" at Jerusalem. It was not for the poor other-than-saints-[Rom. 15:26].

In 1 Cor. 13:3, we read, '*Though I bestow all my goods to **the poor**...it profits me nothing*'. Without the attributes that follow, giving to the poor is totally wasted. It is safe to say that many social and humanitarian agencies are wasted effort as far as reaching "the lost" are concerned.

When Paul wrote, "*Only that they should remember **the poor***", it was addressed to the *ethnos* of the House of Israel where *ethnos* is unfortunately translated as "heathen" here. [The un-translated Latin word "Gentiles" is used of Israel also].

ABOUT "SHALL ALL MEN SEE THAT YE ARE MY DISCIPLES".

Now we can look at this from another angle.

John 13:35 *A new commandment I give unto you, That ye should love one another. By this shall all [men know] that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.*

Jesus is speaking to a particular group. From a language usage point of view we can confirm that this is confined to Israelites. The important point here is that if the love is shared outside of the group to every other group, then no one anywhere would be able to see what God's people had amongst themselves. It was clear in the early church, "*No man durst join them*". It was not as today where people usually cannot visibly see any difference in those who profess to believe and those who do not. When we find Jesus saying this was a new commandment, the statement is a direct quote from the Law. Jesus was strengthening the Law to the same level that He was to demonstrate when he laid down His life for His people. It was a new commandment in this sense.

GIVING.

Next we can look at giving:

Matt. 5:22 ***Give** to him that asketh of you.*

Here again it is to His disciples [one Jew, eleven Galileans] who were among those who, from the context, we can determine were those who knew the Law, i.e. they were Israelites. We are told in Matt. 7:6 to not "*give that which is holy unto the dogs, nor pearls before swine*". So giving is to a specific people. We are NOT to give to certain people.

Matt. 10:7-10 *As ye go preach saying, the kingdom of heaven is at hand, heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils; freely as ye have received freely **give**. Provide neither gold nor silver, nor brass in your purses.*

This was quoted earlier but not in the context of giving. As always, the first thing and action is to proclaim the certain thing, "*The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*". The signs follow the proclamation of God given authority. What is freely given is again not material things because they were to go out without money or anything else! No much raising money for charity here and we can see that raising money is the natural approach, but this is sacrifice, not obedience.

Matt. 10:42 *And whosoever shall **give** one of these little ones a drink of cold water only in the name of a disciple....*

Here is a change from *didomi* to a different word *potizo* for 'give' which is never used apart from drinking water, milk and the Spirit.

No we come to a differing situation where 'gave' is *potizo*.

Matthew 25:37 *Then shall the righteous answer him saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered and fed thee, and thirsty and **gave** thee drink. When saw we thee a stranger and took thee in, naked and clothed thee. Or when saw we thee sick or in prison and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto*

*them, verily I say unto you. Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these **my brethren**, ye have done it unto me.*

Note the “my Brethren” that Jesus ‘was made like unto’. The context here is national, not individual, as it concerns separating the goats from the sheep. These two run together in the ‘field’ but are separated at this judgement time. Few churches will accept this because it is racial. [Esau’s descendants or Edom are the goats. The Encyclopaedia Judaica says, “Modern Jewry is Edom”]. Edom is good at raising money, advocating that ‘money fixes everything’ and promoting borrowing money, even in the church. Edom is the eternal enemy of Israel and we are told in the Bible that Israel would have war with Amalek [descendent of Esau] for all generations. This war is still going on! Edom cohabits with Israel, and are from the same parents. This mixture is with the churches. No one can discern the difference until they acknowledge this mixture exists. Other foreigners are often obvious.

*Luke 6:30 **Give** to every man that asketh of you, and of him that taketh away thy goods ask them not again.*

Here “give” is again *didomi* but ‘every man’ is in the limited form “*pas*” which limits the group concerned to the context. It is not *holos*. One party here are the disciples and the other group are Israelites ‘sinners’ who are not yet disciples. Sin is the transgression of the Law that was only given to Israel as a Covenant. “Give and it shall be given unto you” of Luke 6:38 is the same in application as is Luke 9:13, “Give ye them to eat”. Luke 10:17 the word ‘give’ is mutual to the one group because the disciples were told, “Go NOT but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel”. Likewise Luke 11 is about giving good gifts to YOUR children and the Father giving the Holy Spirit of these that ask Him. “Them” is those of YOUR [Israel’s] children. The same applies in Luke 12 about giving alms. In all these examples, this giving is confined to Israel.

*Luke 20:22 Is it lawful to **give** tribute to Caesar or no?.*

This has no connection with giving to the poor unless it is concerned with the things of God.

*John 4:7 Then cometh a woman of Samaria to draw water Jesus saith unto her, **Give** me to drink.*

It is not *potizo* here as is usually used in connection with drinking. ‘Give’ is *didomi* right through this section and is about giving to and from God, not of man to and from man.

*Acts 5:31 Him hath God exalted to be a Prince and a Saviour to **give** repentance UNTO ISRAEL, and forgiveness of sins.*

This again is about God giving, but this verse once again concerns limiting repentance and forgiveness of sins, through Jesus, to Israel. “All men” refers to “all men of Israel” in all cases unless the context determines otherwise.

*Acts 20:35 And to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said; it is more blessed to **give** than to receive.*

Here Paul was talking with elders of a church about the Word of God that was able to build them up and give them an inheritance, patrimony or heirship, that is that which was promised to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. This is the “holy nation” Peter encourages to make their calling and election sure.

*Rom. 12:20 Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if the thirst **give** him to drink, for in doing so thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head.*

The emphasis here is upon “your” enemies within Israel. This is the usual usage of the word “*echthros*”. “All men” here is again in the limiting form.

*2 Cor. 9:7 Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him **give**.*

This is addressed to brethren or *adelphos* which means from the same womb. That is, the kin of Israel. “Every man’ here is *hekastos* which is used in the sense of “All went to be taxed, every man to his own city”.

*Eph 4:28 Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labour working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to **give** to him that asketh.*

‘Give’ here is sharing and concerns “the church” which is those who are “*huios thesia*” or being placed as *huios* [or sons] out of the *teknon* [or children] of Israel. Again this is limiting those who are shared with.

WHAT THE SOCIAL GOSPEL LACKS.

Giving in the sense of the Social Gospel may be of no profit at all.

1 Cor. 13:3 And, though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.

This is about having agape love. Without having that there is no profit. Without all the attributes following this verse, there is no profit. Without being redeemed no one can have that sort of love no matter how much they try. Without having personal reality about the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, nothing will remain of anything done. The kind of love demanded is the same kind as Jesus displayed to us when "*He gave His life for our sines, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God the father*". The will of the father must be a factor of to whom and when we give.

This seems to cover all the New Testament Scriptures about our part in giving. In all of this there is no suggestion of willy-nilly giving of material things to all and sundry, needy or otherwise.

WIDOWS.

*Luke 4:25 But I tell you a truth. Many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when great famine was throughout all the land. But unto none of them was Elias sent, save unto Sarepta, a city of Sidon, unto a woman that was a **widow**.*

We can be like those in that synagogue who were filled with wrath at the very thought that we should not go to every widow. Although this widow lived in Sidon, the story shows she was one Israelite who was prepared to believe God.

*Acts 6:1 And in those days there arose a murmuring of the Grecians against the Hebrews, because their **widows** were neglected in the daily ministration .*

There is a daily ministration [or relief giving] to widows here, a function no longer seen or practised in any church. The widows were, "their widows", that is they were those widows who were Greek-speaking Israelites. This portion can not be generalised to cover groups outside of the body of disciples in both parts of Israel

*Acts 9:39 And all the **widows** stood by him weeping, and showing the coats and garments which Dorcas made whilst she was with them.*

Dorcas is described as a 'certain' disciple. Although this word 'tis is translated many ways, it is a word that divides one type of person from another.

*1 Cor. 7:8 I say therefore to the unmarried and the **widows**, it is good for them that they abide even as I.*

Here Paul is addressing Corinthians who are given identity as Israelites in 1 Cor. 10:1-2 by "*how that our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were baptised unto Moses*". This is followed a description of things that followed after their Exodus of Israel. Once again, the widows are confined by the context to being Israelites.

*1 Tim. 5:3-4 Honour **widows** that are widows indeed. But if any **widow** have children or nephews, let them first show piety at home, to requite their parents.*

Widows 'indeed' is mentioned twice here and we see that these only are to be supported by the church. This is confirmed in 1 Tim.5:16. 'Indeed' or *ontos* is used ten times to denote absolute certainty. So, once again there restrictions upon which widows are to have help. And the context limits this to the church.

*1 Tim 5:11 But, the younger **widows** refuse.*

The context is about widows who have washed the SAINTS' feet, a function we would not expect from widows outside the Church.

*James 1:27 Pure religion and undefiled before God and the father is this; To visit the fatherless and **widows** in their affliction and to keep himself unspotted by the world.*

This again is addressed to the Twelve Tribes and the context is of those assembled to worship Jesus. So, attending to the needs of these widows is limited to them.

Identity of the two parts of Israel is another subject, but the House of Judah and the House of Israel remain separate entities until the time of the second advent-[Isaiah 11].

THE SOCIAL GOSPEL VERSUS THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM.

When we look at things like the current vogue for ecumenism, the prime emphasis relates to those things we saw earlier that Jesus did not do. Jesus is supposed to have instituted a Social Gospel. Roman Catholics say that the Gospel centres on "the person, message and gracious activity of Christ", rather than the evangelical view of the atonement. Ecumenism is an attempt to submerge this view of the atonement and replace it with a solidarity which emphasises the quest for peace, justice, disarmament, human rights,

religious freedom, the defence against abortion, denouncing torture, the release of prisoners of conscience, the end of slavery, the elimination of sexual discrimination, the freedom of sexual preference, acceptance of homosexuality, inner city renewal and such social issues, and of course, racial equality. The latter, racial equality, is something not found through the Bible. In fact, racism seems to be the prime sin against the Social Gospel. There is racism in the Bible up to the New Jerusalem where Israel is found within the City of God, with all the other races being outside. The starting point of the 'World Church' view is not the Bible starting point. To the 'World Church', what it terms salvation is racially universal in scope. There are no 'chosen race', no 'elect nation' or even 'brethren' in its Bible meaning. Instead we find this replaced with 'The Brotherhood of Man', where there is open fellowship with every age, race and culture. Unity in the Social Gospel is said to be a sign that the Kingdom has arrived. This is the Kingdom of Man with a non-Biblical definition.. This is not what Jesus said as we have seen in the opening passages of the paper.

ADULTERY.

Adultery is another major issue that the United Nations and Social Gospel churches refuse to treat seriously, treating it as being normal. They will never campaign against it. But, Jesus dealt with this subject on a personal level, and said, "*Go and sin no more*". So it is sin! Adultery is perhaps the greatest cause of social distress and family breakdown. The consequence of family breakdown is an increase in taxation, insecurity and other ills.

DIVORCE.

Divorce is opposed by some that promote the Social Gospel, notably the Roman Catholic Church. They have a problem in their attitude that that Church has inherited the promises made to Israel, because God is a divorcee in that He gave a Bill of Divorcement to the House of Israel. This would mean that the R.C.s are divorced by God!!

THE WORLD CHURCH AND THE UNITED NATIONS.

Most of the 'World Church' view is identical to the principles and purposes of the United Nations, the notable exception be related to abortion. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights has the appearance of the surface of being a good moral statement, but we find it is not so because definitions are changed, especially when it comes to "the family". Even religious freedom and everything else is subject to modification by the United Nations purposes which take rights off one party to give them to another. The 'World Church' view is that of World Government, and this under man, not God. The Laws of the Kingdom do not feature in their thinking. Both the World Church and World Government seek to silence those who write, speak or present "The Gospel of The Kingdom of God". They seek to present "The Gospel of Universal Salvation" which concerns the Social Gospel. The two Gospels are radically different. One brings God's blessing and the other brings God's curse.

RACISM.

Racism seems to be the prime target of World Government. With a little thought we can see that it actually is National Israel or the Kingdom of God over Israel that is targeted. Anti-racism on the part of religious people who promote the Social Gospel is illogical. God made the separate races so that is racism on the part of God. We have to ask if God made a mistake when He made the races. If God did not make the races as He says, then who did? When God says that He severed Israel from the other races [plural], this is racism on the part of God.

That the specific application as shown through this paper may be thought to be difficult, especially when 'race' is mentioned, is not our problem. Our part is to believe God. That the Old Testament is totally racist cannot be denied, it has to be faced that the fulfilment of prophecy must be fulfilled in the particular people specified and that this includes none other. There is a lot of racial detail in the New Testament that is hidden by the translators' choice of words; their doctrinal belief being written into the translations. This is passed onto readers who cannot see this because of years of pre-conditioning. Christians have two Testaments that seem to contradict because it is seldom taught that Jesus said if we did not believe Moses and the prophets we could not understand His words. The World Church refuses to believe Moses and the Prophets.

GOD SO LOVED THE WORLD.

The particular scriptures that seem to contradict the gospel of the Kingdom are "*Go into all the world*" and "*God so loved the world*", together with grammatical misuse of "all", "every", and "whosoever", etc.. This matter has been put together in a paper entitled, "*The Two Most Misused Verses In The New Testament*". In this the difficult subject of identity is touched upon because this is a problem to people, especially to those who have been led to believe that Jews and Israel are synonymous words. The reader might well find that he is an Israelite indeed! There is some reference to non-Israel races and there is no suggestion that they are all condemned to hell! This is another subject; and this paper is available to any who request it.

CONCLUSION.

Questions are asked as to why the churches are not experiencing the power of God. It is too easy to say, "We do not believe enough" or something like that, although there is some truth in this because belief and obedience go together. If we do not accept what Jesus says, we do not obey enough. To believe Jesus we have to accept what Jesus says about the "Gospel of the Kingdom" and what this means in contradistinction to the Social Gospel. We have to accept that there is what Paul calls "another gospel". It may be that this cannot be discerned until we admit that there is such a thing. We either believe God or we do not.

The Social Gospel can never display the power and authority of the Kingdom of Heaven. What God's people are to hold forth is the Word of Life-[Phil 2:16]. Jesus said, *I am the bread of life*" And Isaiah said,

Isaiah 55:1-4 Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? And ye labour for that which satisfieth not? Hearken diligently unto me, and eat that which is good, let your soul delight in fatness. Incline your ear unto me, and come unto me and your soul shall live.

And we do better than Phillip and Paul and Peter and others ?

Acts 8:5 The Phillip went down to the city of Samaria, and PREACHED CHRIST unto them.

1 Cor 2:1 And when I came unto you.....declaring unto you the testimony of God. For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus and him crucified.

Acts 9:34 And Peter said unto him, Aneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole.

Acts 11:30 Spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus.

Acts 17:3 This Jesus whom I preach unto you is Christ.

Acts 19:17 And, the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified.

Acts 28:23 He testified the kingdom of God persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets.....

The Social Gospel will never win a soul!