

SERIOUS QUESTIONS

By

Arnold Kennedy

Published by:

Christian Identity Ministries

PO Box 146

Cardwell QLD 4849

Australia

Email: hr_cim@bigpond.com

SERIOUS QUESTIONS

Arnold Kennedy

These questions concern the Biblical relationship between Israel and the balance of races. In asking these questions, it has been necessary to give some detail in order to understand why these questions are being asked. Personal attacks are often used to avoid facing up to issues. It is appreciated that these questions will raise further questions, particularly about other races, but these questions are asked because popular interpretations are but mechanisms to get around difficulties regarding race in the Bible. Expressions of racial differences are not expressions of racial hatred or of racial disharmony, but they are Bible facts that cannot be denied.

QUESTION ONE.

CONSIDERING THAT THE OLD COVENANT WAS MADE WITH ISRAEL ALONE, HOW CAN WE NOW SAY THAT THE NEW COVENANT WAS MADE WITH RACES WHO DID NOT FIRST HAVE THE OLD COVENANT? HOW COULD ANY OTHER RACE HAVE A "NEW" COVENANT IF THEY NEVER HAD HAD AN OLD COVENANT?

There is there not one direct statement in both Testaments to contradict Hebrews 8:8 [fulfilling Jer.31:31] to say that the New Covenant is made with any but the House of Israel and the House of Judah.

QUESTION TWO.

THERE ARE MANY MANY SCRIPTURES THAT SAY GOD'S PEOPLE [RACE] ARE HIS PEOPLE [ISRAEL] BEFORE THEY ARE SAVED, SO WHERE DO WE GET THE IDEA THAT PEOPLE BECOME GOD'S PEOPLE AFTER THEY ARE SAVED?

Isaiah 53:8 "for the transgression of MY PEOPLE was he stricken".

Matt.1:2 "For he shall HIS PEOPLE from their sins"

Luke 1:77 "To give the knowledge of salvation unto HIS PEOPLE."

Luke 1:68 "For He hath visited and redeemed HIS PEOPLE."

Psalm 130:8 "And He shall redeem ISRAEL".

Galatians 4:5 "To redeem them that were under the Law".

The words "yasha' ", "yeshun'ah" and "yasha' [saved and salvation] are used only in relationship to Israel. We find the same with "soteria" and "soterion". {Note: The "Salvation is come to the Gentiles" of Rom.11:11 does not contradict this as is shown in a later question}. "Redeem" and "redemption" also are found only in connection with Israel.

QUESTION THREE.

GOD IS DESCRIBED IN SCRIPTURE [KJV] AS BEING THE "GOD OF ISRAEL" 201 TIMES, SO WHY ARE WE LED TO BELIEVE THAT THIS RESTRICTION IS NOT VALID, WHEN WE STILL CANNOT FIND SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO, OR PATTERN OF, GOD BEING THE GOD OF OTHER RACES?

QUESTION FOUR .

WHY SHOULD WE UNIVERSALISE "ISRAEL" TO MEANS ALL RACES, EITHER NOW OR IN THE FUTURE?

Ezek. 37:26-28 "I will make with them a covenant of peace....and the heathen shall know that I the Lord do sanctify ISRAEL when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of THEM for evermore".

Even at this prophesied time in the future, Israel is still separated, and the other races know it.

QUESTION FIVE.

WHEN THE TWO PARTIES ARE EPHRAIM AND JUDAH, WHY SAY THEY ARE ISRAEL AND NON-ISRAEL?

[1] Why is mention always only about the House of Israel and the House of Judah?

[2] In the New Jerusalem, why are only Israelites within the city -[see Zechariah], with the other races being outside?

[3] Why are the names of the twelve tribes only upon the gates?

[4] In the parables of the two sticks and of the dry bones are the two parties the House of Israel and the House of Judah, so why do we pretend they are Israelites and non-Israelites?

QUESTION SIX .[A group of questions].

[1] Why should we not accept the following statement, which is a racial statement, as it stands?

Lev.20:26 "For I the Lord am holy, and have severed you from other people that you should be mine".

There are many other verses like this, such as those below. When God severed Israel from the other races, there is no indication that this severance was for any limited period, in fact the opposite is shown. This separation is a racial separation, or it might be said that it is racism on the part of God.

[2] If racial statements like this are said to have changed some time later, when was this? The same question applies to the sections below.

Deut. 4:7-8. *"For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh to them.....and what nation is there so great that hath statutes and judgements so righteous as this law, which I set before YOU this day."*

This is a verse which establishes the fact that the Statutes [= "choq"] and the Judgements [= "mishpat"] connects with Israel in a way that does not apply to other races.

[NOTE: This does not mention other parts of the total law, i.e. "Torah", "Mishmereth", "Chugqab", "Mitsveh" and "Tsegdaqab" which are translated in a mixed up way as ordinances, charges, commands, statutes, and justice, all of which are first mentioned in connection with Abraham...These other parts existed before what is commonly called, "The giving of the Law"].

Moses, speaking to Israel alone, declares in verse 13 that this does involve The Ten Commandments.

Deut. 4:13 *"And He declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments and he wrote them upon two tables of stone"*.

The Old Covenant was made with Israel as a nation alone, even if there was a "mixed multitude" there with Israel at that time. The issue here is not the Law as a total, but the covenant made to the congregation of Israel [*qahal*], in isolation from the mixed multitude journeying with them [*edab*].

[3] Why not accept this racial statement...when is it supposed to have changed?

Deut. 4:37 *"And, because He loved thy fathers, therefore He chose THEIR SEED after them"*.

This is a genetic statement! This reference to the seed of Israel continues through the New Testament. It is sometimes presented in connection with the words "called," "chosen," "inheritance," "predestined," "redeemed," "elect," "foreknown" and "purchased possession". We have to ask if this "seed" of the Fathers is genetic [physical] or spiritual. If it is claimed that this is now a spiritual seed, we have to be able to say when this changed [if we can]. "Thy Fathers" in this verse, as in so many other verses, refers to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and not just Abraham as those who like to spiritualise the "seed of Abraham" want to insist. We are told three times "In Isaac shall thy seed be called" [Gen.21:12, Rom.9:7 and Heb.11:18], and so how can any other race be included?

[4] Why not accept this statement of God's sovereignty?

Deut.7:6 *"For you are a holy [separate] people unto the Lord your god. The Lord your God has chosen you to be a special people unto himself, above all the people that are upon the face of all the earth"*.

This is one of the early Bible statements about the unique exclusive "special people" place of Israel racially among the races on the whole earth. We have to ask if this continues into the New Testament; if not, whatever happened to this special race? Paul records about the Potter who made differing vessels according to His purposes-[Rom.9:20-23], and asks who do we think we are to argue with God. Christians still want to argue and find it hard to believe what the New Testament says about "vessels of wrath" which are "fitted to destruction" and "vessels of mercy" which are "afore prepared for mercy". God did make a decision and a choice upon a racial basis.

If Israel as a seed was to disappear as a race from the Bible, prophecy would forecast this. Paul asks, "Has God cast away His people? God forbid" -[Rom.11:1]. The separation of all Israel into two houses still existed of whom "part" were blinded [V7] but Israel as a whole "hath not obtained...". It is not commonly taught that this separation still exists, but it will exist until Jesus returns - [Isaiah 11 shows the timing factors and the "envy" that continues between the House of Israel and the House of Judah until the re-gathering time].

5. What authority is there to teach that all races can be "Jacob", or God's inheritance?

Deut. 32,9 *"For the Lord's portion is HIS PEOPLE, JACOB is the lot of His inheritance"*.

"His People" are not every race on earth, as we can see. "People" here is 'am, which is used in the sense of a tribe among other peoples. There is not one clear statement anywhere in scripture to say that any other race than Jacob [Israel] genetically is God's inheritance. "Jacob" is mentioned 24 times in the New Testament and so there is no change to this racial identity.

6. Why try to change and extend this?

Deut 33,29 *"Happy art thou, O ISRAEL who is like unto thee O people saved by the Lord"*!

The Apostle Paul concludes his discourse about two parties by saying, "And so shall all Israel be saved"-[Rom.11:6]. The two parties concerned are the House of Judah and the House of Israel, not Israelites and non-Israelites. The "middle wall of partition" was between these two. In truth then, is there any other race "like unto thee"? Does God in fact make a difference between races? He certainly does in all these scriptures. Has our unchanging God changed?

7. As God is racist, here and elsewhere, why should we not be the same?

Numbers 23,9 *"Lo, this people shall dwell ALONE, and SHALL NOT BE RECKONED AMONG THE NATIONS"*.

This again presents the separation racially of Israel from the other nations.

QUESTION SEVEN.

[1] AS JESUS SAYS HE HAS IT AGAINST THE CHURCHES WHICH HOLD THE DOCTRINE OF BALAAM, WHY THEN CONTINUE TO HOLD A TEACH THIS DOCTRINE?

This matter is the subject of 1 Cor. 10:8 which is stated as being given for an example. With 60 references by name as well as many indirect references, there should be no doubt as to what this doctrine is about.

[2] Why seek to change this meaning of fornication from that of racial intermarriage?

In the New Testament the call is still to "*Come ye out from among them and be ye separate....*"-[2 Cor.6:17] "Touch" or *haptomai* here is a word used of carnal intercourse with a woman, like it or not -[confirm this in 1 Cor. 7:1-3]. The "them" in this verse are "unclean" people [not 'things' which is inserted as an added word] that are not to be "touched". "Unclean" or *akathartos* shows that there is a difference between 'clean' and 'unclean' people, with the clean not to 'touch' the unclean. The "yoke" in 2 Cor. 6:14 is with *heterozygeo* which means a different sort [Vine], or one who is not an equal [Thayer]. God also made clean and unclean animals and fish; each were born that way. There is frequent reference to show that God's judgement is upon those of Israel who transgress by having this common carnal intercourse with other races. This shows up also through the New Testament. Jesus says in the Revelation that He holds it against the churches which hold the Doctrine of Balaam-[Rev.2:14]. From the 60 mentions of Balaam, what this doctrine is is quite clear. Because almost all denominations hold the doctrine of Balaam without knowing it, we can understand just why it is never taught. Probably few know what this doctrine is, but all should if Jesus holds it against them! 2 Peter 2:15 indicates that people with this doctrine have gone astray. Jude v11 calls it an error.

New Testament "fornication" has not changed from what Old Testament fornication was, even if we like to try to say that porneuo has no racial connection today. In 1 Cor.10:8 we are told that all that is mentioned in this passage, are for examples to us. When we read what one example is, we find, "*Neither let us commit fornication as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand*". Look back to the Old Testament and find that what caused three and twenty thousand to die was Israelites having sex with non-Israelites-[Numbers 25:1-]. Moses even demanded that all Israelites who did this should be slain because of the idolatry that followed. King Solomon got caught this way and it also led to idolatry. We read of plagues in Israel because of this -[Numbers 25:6-8]. Ezra 10 tells that divorce is demanded where "strange" or "*nokrij*" non-Israelite wives are concerned. See also Nehemiah 13:23-27. These things are written for our admonition we are told in 1 Cor. 10:11, but because of the popular but wrong doctrine to the contrary, this necessity for admonition is not accepted today. Jezebel [also a foreign wife] is permitted in the churches today even if Jesus says He holds it against the churches-[Rev.2:20]. What this means is that the New Testament doctrine about racial intermarriage is the same as that in the Old Testament. **So, when did the doctrine change to the belief that God no longer requires Israel to dwell alone, not to intermarry with other races, and be separate from the other races?** In context, the temptation *that is common to man* [the Israel man] is racial intermarriage, so why should Billy Graham or anyone else use it on new converts out of context?

QUESTION EIGHT.

WHY IGNORE ALL THE MULTITUDE OF "ONE NATION" VERSES?

2 Samuel 7,23 *"And what ONE NATION in the earth is like thy people, even like ISRAEL, whom God went to redeem A PEOPLE, and to make Himself a name."*

Note the singular emphasis here, and that redemption refers to this singular people alone. It is Israel alone who are stated to be the people God went to redeem. Galatians 4:5 and Hebrews 9:15 confirm that the mediation of the New Covenant was for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the First Testament [Israel only]. See also Titus 2:14 and Luke 2:38. To redeem something means that it must have belonged once before, and so redemption can only apply to Israel.

Psalm 78:5 *"For he established a testimony in Jacob, and a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers".*

This is another scripture confirming many along this line. But where can we find any scriptures giving even a suggestion that the Law and Covenants were given to other races? "Our fathers" and "the fathers" are common New Testament expressions. So, all these New Testament people being addressed must also be Israelites!

Psalm 147:19-20 *"He hath showed His word unto JACOB, and His statutes unto ISRAEL, HE HATH NOT DEALT SO WITH ANY NATION, and as for his judgements, [they the other nations] have not known them".*

This verse is both limiting and specific and relates exclusively to Israel as a race. Churches in our land that believe this are very few. The "word" here is "*dabar*", or the spoken word in the sense of a specific direction, charge, instruction or covenant. "Statutes" here is "*choq*" and Judgements is again "*mishpat*", as pointed out in the Deut.4:7 in question six.. This is a very clear statement, and note this spoken word is NOT given to other races! This is not a popular concept or popular teaching, but it is confirmed in both Testaments. Acts 10:36 says, "*The Word which God sent to the Children of Israel*". But if God declares "*He hath not dealt so with any nation*" we dare not question this, even if denominations ignore it. Israel is unique! The judgements are "*mishpat*"....or God's verdict or decree.

QUESTION NINE.

WHEN WE READ BIBLE STATISTICS, ARE WE NOT JUSTIFIED IN SAYING THE WHOLE BOOK IS PRIMARILY ADDRESSED TO ISRAEL?

Israel as "Yisra'el"	2,514 times [Old Testament].
Israel as "Israel"	70 times [New Testament].
Jacob [KJV].	358 times [24 times in the New Testament].
Judah	813 times
Ephraim	172 times
Manesseh	143 times
Hebrews	21 times
Lord God of Israel	110 times
God of Israel	90 times
Holy One of Israel	31 times
Lord God of the Hebrews	5 times
Mighty God of Jacob	4 times
Hope of Israel	2 times
Congregation of Israel	160 times [as "qahal"].
" " "	173 times [as "'edah"].
Assembly of Israel	21 times [as "'atsarah"].
"Ekklesia"	116 times in the New Testament.
Tribes [Shebet] of Israel	190 times [Old Testament].
Tribes [Phule] of Israel	31 times [New Testament].
People of Israel	19 times [KJV].
My people	231 times.

Then we find expressions like, Israel's God, the Light of, the Rock of, the Redeemer of, the Stone of, the Shepherd of, the Portion of, the God of; all of which refer expressly to Israel. In the KJV we find the words:

"of Israel" occur 1,692 times!

"to Israel" occur 23 times!

"for Israel" occur 24 times!

Then there are expressions like the "*The God of your fathers*" and "*fathers of Israel*" ["fathers" is mentioned 549 times including 56 through the New Testament], so there is no doubt about the sole race concerned because "*pater*" is a genetic term in context.

There is the intimate word "*Jeshurun*" for Israel. There are at least 5,000 direct references isolating Israel as a people. This personal God OF ISRAEL, Jehovah, ["*Yehovah*"] is mentioned 6,528 times by this name and 21 times as "*Yabb*".

QUESTION TEN.

Why are we not taught exactly whom and whom only are gathered to God in the end?

Jer.50:6 says "*My people hath been lost sheep. It was the "sheep" that Jesus says He came to give His life for-[John 10:15]. Jesus said, "I lay down my life for the sheep". He goes on to say these sheep are from both the Judean and the Dispersion folds. Sheep are born sheep. Goats are conceived as goats according to God's Law "after their kind". Tares come from tare seed. The tares are to be burned and the goats are to be separated. They cannot ever change how they were created. Paul contends, "Who are we to argue with God as to how the potter makes any vessel"-[Rom.9:21]. The "election" is made before "having done good or evil"-[Rom.9:11]. Election is not because of God's fore-knowledge of what a person was going to do in the future; this is what many try to say to get around the truth.*

The gathering, or the re-gathering as it is often called is always presented in the Bible as being that of Israel. Jesus mourned over Jerusalem -[Matt.23:37] and His people whom He came to save....not over any non-Israel race. Jesus gathers only His Elect nation-[Matt.24:29]. Jesus gathers "*together in one the children of God that are scattered abroad*"-[John 11:49-52]. Note that they are "*God's children*" before they are gathered.

QUESTION ELEVEN.

WHO IS BEING ADDRESSED IN THE BOOK OF ACTS? WHY TEACH SOMETHING DIFFERENT?

The genetic fathers of Israel are mentioned in at least 20 verses through the book of Acts. These are the genetic 'fathers' of those being addressed. God as being the "*God of OUR fathers*" and "*the God of Jacob*" is mentioned five times in the Book of Acts. In addition, consider the additional racially specific verses:

Acts 2:22 "*Ye men of Israel, hear these words"*

Acts 2:36 "*Let all the House of Israel know assuredly...."*

Acts 3:12 *"Ye men of Israel why marvel ye at this..."*
Acts 3:22-24 *"For Moses truly said unto the fathers, a prophet shall the Lord God raise up
unto you, of your brethren, like unto me...."*

The limitation to Israel is specific. "Unto you" means unto the Israelites being addressed. That denominations like to extend this to include all races does not make it valid. Note that this is post-Pentecost, and in this church age; so it is not in this age that anything changed, even if most say it did according to popular teachings. The "fathers" and "your brethren" are again racially selective and are definitive.

Acts 3:25 *"Ye are the children of the prophets...and of the covenant which God made with our fathers."*
This is a RACIAL statement! It concerns only one race. Scripture is not supposed to be racist according to popular doctrine, is it? So when could this have changed after the Book of Acts?

Acts 10:36 *"The word which God sent unto the Children of Israel..."*
This confirms the Old Testament in Psalm 147:19 where we read, "He showeth His word unto Jacob, and His statutes unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation..." Note the clear "not" in this verse. This also is racist, but it is Biblical!

Acts 13:17 *"The God of this people Israel chose our fathers"*
There are a multitude of Old Testament scriptures confirming this racial selection. We cannot ignore the relationship between Israel, "our fathers" and the people being addressed. They are the same race.

Acts 13:23-24 *"According to His promise raised up UNTO ISRAEL, a Saviour, Jesus..."*
Acts 5:31 *"To give repentance to ISRAEL", and forgiveness of sins"*
This verse is one of many that say Jesus was raised up unto Israel. The original promise was made to Israel only. There are no statements at all extending this beyond "all men" of Israel in context. Again this is racial in purpose.

Acts 13:26 *"Men and brethren, of the stock of Abraham...is this word of salvation sent..."*
We do not find any stream of references about the word of salvation being sent to any but Israel. This is yet another racial statement; we cannot change the meaning of "stock" and its 'kin' connection.

Acts 13: 32 *"And we declare unto you the glad tidings, how that the promise which was
made unto the fathers, God has fulfilled the same unto us their children...."*
This is a straight genetic statement. The prophetic promise was made only to Israel. Who can really continue to pretend that Paul was speaking to non-Israelites [so-called Gentiles]? Paul goes on to tell about justification through Jesus "by which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses", showing that he was speaking only to Israelites.

QUESTION TWELVE.

WHO ARE SAVED AND TURNED TO GOD?

Look at the highlighted words from the New Testament; they eliminate all but one specific race only.

Matthew 1:21. *"And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call His name Jesus, for he shall save His people from their sins."*
Luke 1:16 *"And many of the Children of Israel shall be turn to the Lord their God."*
Luke 1: 55 *"He has helped His servant Israel, in remembrance of His mercy, as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to His seed forever".*
Luke 1:68-9 *"Blessed be the Lord God of Israel for He hath visited and redeemed His people. And has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the House of His servant Davidas He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets.....to perform the mercy promised to our fathers....."*
Luke 1:77 *"To give knowledge of salvation unto His people by the remission of their sins".*
Luke 2: 34 *"Behold, this Child is set for the rising again of many in Israel."*
John 1:31 *But that He should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptising in water".*
Acts 5:30 *"The God of our fathers raised up Jesus.....to be a Prince and a Saviour.....to give repentance to Israel".*

Many Christians are fond of Isaiah 53, but they have not noticed the limitation of verse 8, "for the transgression of my people was He stricken". The popular beliefs infers that Isaiah was wrong. **Has this really changed to include every other race?** Those who want to be able to say this have to be able to say just when it happened and why Isaiah and other prophets were wrong.

QUESTION THIRTEEN

WHO WILL JESUS ULTIMATELY RULE OVER?

Matthew 2:6 *"Out of thee shalt come a Governor, that shall rule my people ISRAEL".*

Luke 1:32-33 *"And the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David, and He shall reign over the House of Jacob for ever.*

Here we are told the ultimate rule is stated to be over Israel. No one can make the "House of Jacob" or "Israel" mean all races. Denominations do not like these restrictions, and so ignore them.

Acts 1:6 *"Lord, will you at this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel"?*

Jesus agrees with this, but does not disclose the time factors.

QUESTION FOURTEEN

WHO WAS JESUS SENT TO AND TO WHOM DID HE SEND THE DISCIPLES?

Matt. 15:24 *"I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel".*

Matt.10:6 *"But go rather to the lost sheep of the House of Israel".*

Matt. 11:10 *"I send my messenger before Thy face which shall prepare Thy way before Thee".*

Malachi's message was to Israel only. It is recorded in the parables that the labourers were sent into the "vineyard", and "last of all He sent unto THEM His Son". We do not find a specific statement about Jesus being sent to others. This is the particular "kosmos" that Jesus came to save.

Luke 4:43 *"I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also, FOR THEREFORE AM I SENT...and He preached in the synagogues of Galilee".*

Jesus confined His proclamation to Israelites, involving Judahites and Galileans. These were separated by a clear border-[John 7:1], and most of His ministry was in Galilee, not in Judea.

Luke 11:49 *"Therefore says the wisdom of God, I will send THEM them prophets and apostles".*

The context here is totally that of Israel.

Luke 13:24 *"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets, and stonest them THAT ARE SENT UNTO THEE, how often would I have gathered THY CHILDREN together...".*

Could we extend these scriptural limitations?

Acts 3:20 *"And He shall SEND Jesus Christ which before was preached unto YOU".*

Peter here goes on to tell about Moses's prophecy about Jesus being raised up UNTO ISRAEL; the people being spoken unto as being the children of the prophets OF ISRAEL. Can we really extend this constraint and say Moses was wrong?

QUESTION FIFTEEN. [About the meaning of "Gentiles"].

[a] HOW IS IT THAT THOSE THAT PAUL, THE APOSTLE TO THE GENTILES, WROTE TO HAD THE " FATHERS" ABRAHAM, ISAAC AND JACOB?

[b] HOW COULD THEY BE OTHER THAN ISRAELITES?

[c] HOW COULD NON-ISRAELITES HAVE BEEN BAPTISED UNTO MOSES IN THE RED SEA?

Determination of this word and its meaning are critical. Concordances and Bible dictionaries will not always help, and will often only show usage, not meaning. Vine's Expository Dictionary points out that the word "ethnos" denotes "a multitude of people of the same genus.". It can refer thus to Israel or to non-Israel, but "genus" can never be converted into "belief". We could go through each book of the Bible to show that the traditional interpretation of this transliterated Latin word is wrong, but just one verse gives sufficient example to show that the popular meaning/interpretation is wrong. The following verse is said to be written to "Gentiles". Look at this one verse below carefully and then ask if the people being written unto were Israelites or not. Then ask the question, "Whenever could this have changed within this church age?" It had not changed at this stage and this stage is the present 'church age'.

1 Cor. 10:1-2 *"Moreover, Brethren, I would not have you ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the [Red] sea, And were baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea...."*

The whole of this book is in the Israel context and does not include anyone else but Israelites. There is a mass of such confirmation through the New Testament. It is the pre-conditioning about "gentiles" that blinds the eye.

In the KJV the word "ethnos" is translated 64 times as "nations", 5 times as "heathen", 2 times as "people", and 93 times as "gentiles". BUT, we also find the word "hellen" sometimes translated as "Gentiles". The translators have made a sorry mess! Let us look further into this mess. Anyone who cares to take a look in any concordance will find that the words in both Greek and Hebrew for "Gentiles" are also used of Israel. Knowing this, then "have some fun". For instance, anyone can transfer translations for a given word and quickly find that when God said to Abraham, "I will make a great nation of you", it could equally be translated "I will make a great Gentile of You". Rebecca would have had two Gentiles in her womb, and thus Israelites would have to be Gentiles. The word "Gentiles" refers to any group of people of a common origin, and never did mean what Bible dictionaries try to make it mean. It is not difficult to "knock" the popular interpretation to bits of every reference in the New Testament that appears to contradict the right meaning of "Gentiles". We can look at every so-called type, such as the Ethiopian Eunuch -[Acts 8:37]- that is used in support of the wrong meaning and show that they are not valid. Either a look into the original languages or simple questions give us the answer, in this case such as:

-*"Would a black man have been allowed into the Temple at that time?"*
 -*"What would a black non-Israelite man be doing going to an Israelite feast?"*
 -*"Would we expect him to be reading the prophets?"*
 -*Could we be sure an Israelite could not have been in the employ of the Queen of Ethiopia?*
 -*Why was there such a fuss when Paul wanted to take a Greek [suspected of being a non-Israelite] into the temple?*

Anyone who uses a territorial/national term and converts the same into a racial term is liable to come to a wrong conclusion, every time. Yet, this is the common experience and teaching. For instance, when we read in Galatians 3:28 and Colossians 3:11, *"Neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision or uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond or free"*, it is popular to treat the territorial terms as being racial terms. Those who promote this idea should then be able to say how four racial terms could cover every other race. What this verse is saying is that it does not matter whether or not the Israelites come from Judea, Greece, Scythia, or whether or not they have a barbarous religion, and whether or not they are circumcised. Further to this, when we read in Revelation 5:9, *"And hath redeemed us by The Blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people and nation"*, it is popular to miss out the meaning of "out" [ek] and make this mean "of" instead of "out of" to try to accommodate every race. The prophets only spoke about Israel in connection with both the Blood and who is gathered to the City. It is also recommended that those supporting the popular doctrine should have a good look into the different meanings of "Christ", "Christ Jesus", "Jesus Christ", "Christ's" etc., according to grammar. For instance, where "christ" is a verbal adjective, no one has any right to translate and use it differently. No translator has any right to put a capital "C" in Galatians 3:16 because it cannot honestly be supported by grammar. That this "cooking the books" has been done for centuries does not make it valid.

In the Old Testament we have people who are used to promote the new doctrine, such as Ruth who was an Israelite who had been living in Moab. We read in the first verse of Ruth about Israelites living in the land of Moab. That their sons married *"women of Moab"*, does not tell us anything about race; Moab was where the women lived just as we find her Israelite family living in the first verse. It was unlawful for any Israelite to marry other than an Israelite, so Ruth would have to be an Israelite, even if she considered herself a foreigner by having taken foreign gods.

Because the Old Testament is so clearly racist we are quoting primarily from the New Testament, because this is where the changes are supposed to have been made. But, perhaps we should look at one more Old Testament verse which spells out the real position.

Jer 31:36 *"If those ordinances depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel shall cease from being a nation before me".*

Note "the seed [zera'] of Israel". Those ordinances, the sun and the moon, have not disappeared yet, and so Israel is still the same people today. As the word for "nation" is the same as that translated "gentile" and "heathen", we could equally read "the seed of Israel shall not cease from being Gentiles before Me". We could even say Israel would not cease from being heathen! This becomes absurd if we take modern meanings! Yet, much more modern teaching is equally as absurd.

QUESTION SIXTEEN.

DO WE REALLY TEACH WHAT "ALL", "EVERY ONE", "WHO-SO-EVER", ETC. ACTUALLY MEANS?

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 Luke 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 "ktizo" is given by:

Strong's G2936-7 as *"original formation, building, creature, and ordinance"*.
 Vine's Dictionary of New Testament Words says *"ktizo" is used among Greeks to mean the foundation of a place, a city, or a colony*. "
 Thayer's Lexicon says: *"To make habitable to people, a place, region, Island" The verb "ktisis" is the act of creating as in Rom. 1:20 and Gal. 6:15 and indicates the product of the creative act. Thayer says further, "The act of founding, establishing, building", and, "of some particular kind or class of created things or beings"*.

This is the "creature" in Mark 16:15. The word *"ktizo"* in the classics is used in the sense of a village, or place where certain people live. The disciples were to go specifically to the places or the villages, cities, colonies or places where the Israelites lived.

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

We cannot make "*the cities of Israel*" to mean the cities of every race. Note here that Jesus is speaking primarily of the time of the end. What is the area of evangelism? Is it not all the world of Israel? What were they teaching? 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 traditional universal gospel to all races and the exclusive Kingdom of Heaven at the same time. Here Jesus is talking about the end of the age. Likewise, He confines "all the world" to the cities of Israel! In other words it is the dwellings or places throughout the earth where the Israelites live, right up to the end of the age.

ARE "ALL", "EVERY", ETC. LIMITED EXPRESSIONS?

In other words, does "all" usually mean "*all of everything*" or "*all of that part being spoken about only*". Does "*all the world*" mean all the 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 and concordances.

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 same way, "go ye into all the world" is not all inclusive of every race. Failure to understand this is the source of error in the normal teaching. Jesus says that it is not given for everyone to hear or to understand. Immediately we have just one exception 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 Jesus said, "Leave them alone", then these cannot be part of the "all" being addressed. Jesus did not preach to certain peoples, as we have seen.

It is recorded that Jesus said ten times, "*Who hath ears to hear, let him hear*". Consider whether or not this means that there are those who cannot hear. Jesus said to the Edomite leaders of Jewry, "*Ye cannot bear my words*"-[John 8:43].

QUESTION EIGHTEEN. - [about "Jews" and "Greeks"].

HOWEVER COULD "GREEKS" MEAN ALL RACES EXCEPT ISRAELITES?

These two parties are whom *the "middle wall of partition"*-[Eph.2:14] is between. A "middle" wall is in the middle of one thing, not in the middle of two quite different things. The one race in two Houses exists today with a wall between them, because the time of the total fulfilment about joining them together again into "*one body*" does not occur until Jesus returns, at which time He leads them both back to the inheritance land-[see Isaiah 11:1-13]. When the Apostle Paul concludes his argument about the Jew and Gentile, he says, "*and so shall all Israel [both parts] be saved*"-[Rom.11:26].

Of course, we all know that grafting in can only take place between trees that are both of a common origin, such as Israel and Judah are. In Romans chapter 11 it is popular to say that metaphor, "*contrary to nature*" means the grafting of things quite different together, suggesting the grafting of non-Israelites into Israel. But Vine points out that it means the grafting of a wild stock into a cultivated tree, rather than the normal grafting of good stock into a wild original. This of course refers to the House of Israel joining the House of Judah. The House of Israel had been divorced by God whereas Judah had not. If we look at the expression, "*God is able to graft them in AGAIN*", those grafted back must have been attached once before they were cut off. The problem again is the Latin word from which we get "Gentiles"; if the meaning was non-Israelites then these were never attached once before.

Where Paul talks about "*neither Jew nor Greek*" in Col.3:11 he is talking to the "elect" who always are Israel as a whole. The same applies in Gal.3:28 where those who had been under the Law [Israel as a whole] become equal and "*all one*" as they individually come under the New Covenant. John 7:35 tells us about those of Israel who are dispersed among the Greeks. What misleads most people is the mistranslation of "*hellen*" to read "gentiles", here and in other places. "Greeks" is used as a synonym of this dispersion 35 times in the New Testament. In no way could "Greeks" mean all the races who were not Judeans. Why would Paul pick just on "Greeks" [meaning Greek speaking] if he meant all races? At this time the Dispersion was centred in parts of the old Greek empire. It has to be noted that the translators did not translate here; they used the Latin-origin word "Gentile" to suit their papal-inspired doctrine.

QUESTION NINETEEN. [ABOUT "STRANGERS" and "ADOPTION"].

[a] WHY TRY TO COVER UP THE FACT THAT THE WORD "STRANGERS" SOMETIMES ALSO APPLIES TO ISRAELITES?

In the Old Testament there certainly are scriptures that look as if they are saying that non-Israelite strangers could become circumcised, keep the Passover, the Laws of Moses and thus become as "*one born in the land*". The immediate necessity is to look at the word "stranger" and similar words like "foreigner", "sojourner" and "alien". In both the Hebrew of the Old Testament and the Greek of the New Testament there are at least eight different words translated as "strangers," "foreigners" and "servants", etc and this is the problem. Our translators [this includes the N.I.V.] have had no system of

consistent translation of any one of these words. That there are "strangers" who are Israelites and "strangers" who are not Israelites is very obvious. The most common word with which there is mis-understanding is the Hebrew word "*ger*", that is translated as "stranger/s" 86 times out of the 92 times it occurs in the Old Testament. The meaning of this word might be summarised as being an Israelite who was living apart from the main body of Israel or their land, i.e. living among, or in the land, of other races. The important fact is that this stranger was an Israelite by race. A word-by-word examination will show the premise about non-Israelites becoming part of racial Israel is not valid. In the wilderness, the congregation of Israel the "*cabal*" could attend the tabernacle but the "*edah*" [also translated "congregation"] could not. But both Israel and non-Israelites travelled together.

[b] Why teach an unscriptural meaning of "Adoption"?

Romans 9:4 "Who are Israelites to whom pertaineth the adoption". The adoption does not pertain to anyone else.

From the Extended Vines Expository Dictionary:

"The A.V. "adoption of children" is a mis-translation and misleading....It is not a putting into the family by spiritual birth....Israel was brought into a special relation with God, a collective relationship not enjoyed by other nations".

Paul writing unto "Gentile" Israelites says Israel alone are the people out of whom the sons can be placed. These are the people who can "be led by the Spirit" from the bondage of the Law into the "glorious liberty of the Children of God". Only Israelites had been under the bondage of the Law. The word "*huiotnesia*" is never used to mean "make anyone a son". It is to "place a son". Each son who is placed already exists as a son. The Greek does not suggest making anyone a son, and some lexicons point this out.

Strongs G5206 also gives "*the placing of a son*".

Following up this in Thayer we find: "*That relationship which God was pleased to establish between Himself and the Israelites, in preference to all other nations.....It also includes that blessed state looked for in the future life after the visible return of Christ from heaven.....i.e. the consummate condition of the sons of God, which will render it evident that they are the sons of God*".

Rom.8:23 "Which have the firstfruits of the spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body".

In this verse we can see an explanation of what "adoption" is, namely the redemption of our body. It only remains to establish if this redemption is available to all and sundry. There is no way "adoption" refers to the popular concept of presently bringing non-Israel into Israel. "Adoption" does not apply to all and sundry races

QUESTION TWENTY.

WHY USE THE EXPRESSION "BORN AGAIN" WHEN JESUS SAID "BORN FROM ABOVE"?

Jesus did not say anything about a second time even if the translations make Him appear to say He did. JESUS DID NOT USE THE WORD "AGAIN" AT ALL HERE! There is no manuscript at all that says Jesus used the word "again". It was Nicodemus who used the word "*deuteros*" = "a second time". Jesus did not use this word "*deuteros*"; Jesus used the word "*anotnen*"

Strongs G509 for "*anotnen*" includes "*from above*", or "*from the first*".

Thayer: "*Anotnen* is used of things that come from heaven [from God], or from a higher [upper] place, or from the very first, or from the origin".

Jesus was speaking of something which existed at the time of speaking. The adverb "*anotnen*" always relates to place and is used of past or former time, never the future time. Knowing this one word difference helps understanding and shows up the problems there are with the popular concept. Jesus confirmed to Nicodemus that He was not speaking of a second birth when He told Nicodemus that He was referring to being born of water and of Spirit. Jesus did not use the future tense as did Nicodemus.

"Born" in John 3:3-5 is "*gennao*" and it is found 98 times in the New Testament. The sense usually has connection with procreation; the most prominent meaning being "beget" or "begotten". We must thus determine the time when Vine [Page 626] we can read, "*The Kingdom of Heaven....is used only....in connection with Israel*". Vine in his notes explains the difference between the two very well.

[b] Where is just one verse in the Bible to say that Christians will "go to heaven" in the popular presentation or concept?

Paul was "caught up" to the "third heaven", yet he remained on earth afterwards. "*Harpaζo*" is used in the N.T. eighteen times, and no one left the earth. "*Great is your reward in heaven*" may well refer to the same place Paul was caught up into.. i.e., the time of the new heavens and a new earth. There are at least six differing "heavens" in scripture grammatically.

QUESTION TWENTY-FOUR . [ABOUT GOING INTO ALL "THE WORLD" "TO EVERY CREATURE"].

WHY TRY TO SAY THAT "KOSMOS" MEANS THE SAME AS "OIKOUMENE" WHEN IT NEVER DID?

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 through Him the world 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 and much loved verses. "The world" has been emphasised. In both cases it is the same word "*kosmos*" in the original Greek. This word "*kosmos*" is probably one of the least understood and mis-used words in the New Testament, and perhaps we should take a short-cut and make statements about the word "*kosmos*" that is usually translated as "world".

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*"].

Its prime meaning is "order", "arrangement" or "beauty", but never the common multi-racial meaning as taught.

It often means that particular world which is being spoken about, to the exclusion of other "worlds".

It can refer to other things than people, e.g. the adornment of woman's hair [-see I Tim.2:9 where "*kosmios*" is translated as "modest"]. This is particularly hard to preach the gospel unto!

"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?].

"Kosmos" is used of the world that was before the flood-[2 Peter 2,5]. This world was destroyed-[Heb.11:7], although the principle continued through Noah and Abraham.

"Kosmos" can mean the whole world of wicked and reprobate men as opposed to the "world" of God's elect.

"Kosmos" is used of the Roman Empire -[John 8:23].

"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 has been shown as being 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 [or "world"] whom God says He loved in the Old Testament.

Deut.7:8 *"But the Lord loved you, and because He would keep the oath which he sware to your fathers..." [Israel].*

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

Isaiah 63:7-9 *"I will mention the loving kindnesses of the Lord.....and the great goodness toward the House of Israel.....in his love and 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 [israel] is mighty, He will save, he will rejoice over them with joy, he will rest in his love".*

Malachi 1,2 *"Yet I loved Jacob....and I hated Esau".*

N.B. If God hated just Esau, then Edom could not be included in the "all" of "Go ye into all the world" and "God so loved the world".

Quoting from R.K. and R.N.Phillips in "*The Book Of Revelation*", part 2, [page 25]:

"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?"

In the Old Testament we have expressions of the Israel people that God "*so loved*." Cast the mind back to all the scriptures in the New Testament which show the exclusive nature of Israel. Both tell of the love of God for Israel in a way which separates Israel from the other races. Are we now to believe that this people Israel have somehow disappeared, despite prophecy to the contrary? If any reader 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 hates 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", but are different worlds.

Pair Two.

John 17:6 *"I have manifested Thy Name unto the men which Thou gavest me out of the world".*

John 17:14+16 *"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 17:18 *"I pray not for the world, but for them which Thou hast given me, for they are Thine"..*

John 3:16 *God so loved the world".*

Might it not be blasphemy to suggest that Jesus would not pray for that world He loved? So He would have to pray for one "world" and not for another! Here are demonstrated three pairs of scriptures which show contrasts in the "worlds" they are talking about.

THE "WORLD" - "KOSMOS" OR "OIKOUMENE" in John 3:16?

These two words are both translated "world", but they are different in application and meaning. "*kosmos*" is determined by context to say which particular world is being spoken of, whereas "*oikoumene*" roughly means the inhabited earth in general. We can see the true meaning of "*oikoumene*" easily in verses like 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 Dianna*" 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.

God's love to 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 whom Jesus died for. It is pointed out again, He *came "to save HIS PEOPLE from their sins"*.

"ALL", "WHO-SO-EVER", "EVERY" ARE LIMITED EXPRESSIONS CONFINED TO EACH CONTEXT.

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. Lexicons support this understanding. The context here is Israel so "*whosoever*" refers to "*whosoever of Israel*".

When we go back to the Old Testament scriptures with understanding we will see many references that say that part of the total law, namely the Statutes, the Judgements and the Ten Commandment were given to Israel ALONE as a covenant. This is vital to understand. 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. No other races could possibly be redeemed or "bought back" again, because they had not been there in the first place.

When Jesus said "*I am the light of the world*", the "world" in each case is the "*kosmos*", not "*oikoumene*". The disciples of Jesus were to be lights to the "*kosmos*" of Israel, not the "*oikoumene*". This is confirmed when Jesus told the disciples to go to only to the lost sheep of the House of Israel. What has changed, and when did it change?

We find a similar difference that is often missed with the word translated "earth". In Isaiah 54:5, for instance we read, "*Thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, the God of the whole earth shall He be called*". The "whole earth" does not mean the whole globe [*ge* or *ghay*]. The word in this verse and others similar is "*erets*"; each race has its own separate "*erets*" or land. John 1:11 confirms this, "*He came unto His own, and His own received Him not*". There are two different words for "own" in this verse; one is His land etc, and the other is His people. It is popular to ignore the differences between "*kosmos*" and "*oikoumene*", and also the difference between "*erets*" and "*ge*" because they cannot fit in with popular all-race doctrines.

Going back to John chapter three where Jesus was talking with 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" connects with what is spoken of immediately above. This provides the context. To whom is Jesus speaking with? This tells us what *kosmos* is being spoken of. The whole subject matter concerns Israelites and a master in Israel, Nicodemus.

Verse 3 They have to be begotten "from above" [not "again" as translated] to be able to perceive [in their minds' eye] the Kingdom. Jesus used the word "*another*"; it was Nicodemus who used the word "*deuteros*" or "a second time", not Jesus. Verses 5-7 Unless this spirit is inherited FROM CONCEPTION, none can enter the Kingdom [1 John 3:9]. "Begotten" and "born" are mixed up by translators and are different in meaning!

Verse 8 We, [the Israelites] have [all] received the Spirit of God].

Verses 14-15 *"Even as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up"*.

To what race did Moses lift up that serpent? What race only was then healed and cleansed from the serpent bites? Jesus was 'lifted up' to the same people, Israel, and Jesus is saying that the "even as" applies just to those same people He died for.

QUESTION TWENTY-FIVE.

WHEN JESUS SENT THE DISCIPLES OUT, WHY DID HE NOT SEND THEM TO ALL RACES?

Mark 16:15 about going into all the "kosmos" and "preaching" [i.e. proclaiming] the gospel to every creature has been quoted. 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 was not sent EXCEPT to the lost sheep of the House of Israel", to what race understand. Immediately we have just one exception 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 Jesus said, "Leave them alone", then these cannot be part of the "all" being addressed. Jesus did not preach to certain peoples, as we have seen.

It is recorded that Jesus said ten times, "Who hath ears to hear, let him hear". Consider whether or not this means that there are those who cannot hear. Jesus said to the Edomite leaders of Jewry, "Ye cannot bear my words"-[John 8:43].

QUESTION TWENTY-SIX.

WHY CONTINUE TO TEACH THAT ALL RACES ARE THEM SAME IN GOD'S SIGHT WHEN THE BIBLE DOES NOT TEACH THIS?

In saying that Israel is still exclusive racially, in covenant terms, it has to be stated clearly that there is no implied disparagement of all the other non-Israel races. Race is a fact of life and it is also an insistent Bible fact that cannot be denied through both Testaments. But, the Bible is primarily a book about the people of the book, Israel. Israel is declared to be a servant race, not a better race than others. "Servant race", this means service to God, not to mankind in general. Israel is presented in scripture as a "stiff necked" rebellious people who have a responsibility given to them to demonstrate to the other races the benefits of compliance with the laws of God. The one great difference between Israel and the other races is that God made a covenant relationship between Himself and Israel that He did not make with other races. This made Israel accountable for keeping the covenant relationship. Breaking the covenant brought judgement upon Israel and it was with the same people who had the old Covenant that God made the New Covenant with-[Heb.8:8]. If God has not recorded in the Bible His purposes for all the other races in the same way He has done for Israel, no one has the right to presume anything about the non-Israel races that is not stated. The sense that Israel are God's chosen people is by covenant relationship. Israel has a heavy accountability and burden that is not laid upon other peoples.

But, we do have evidence that other races are cared for by God, although there are differences between these various races expressed in scripture. We find a blessing given to Hagar and it is recorded that God heard the cry of her son Ishmael-[Gen. 21:17]. We find things like the repentance of Nineveh through the ministry of an Israelite. Nebuchadnezzar had a lengthening of tranquility, a word that does not relate to salvation, through an Israelite man of God. We have Naaman healed through the prayer of a prophet of Israel. Also, within Solomon's great prayer as found in 2 Chronicles 6:32-33 we find Solomon requesting God concerning the stranger "*which is not of Thy people Israel*" and asking God to hear and answer their prayers so that they might know God's name and fear him. This was not a statement by God but was a request made by Solomon. The prayer request was for these strangers to be able to travel to God's house [Solomon's temple] and make their prayers, but this temple was later destroyed. On the other hand we have expressions of God's hatred for certain races such as Edom being called "*the people against whom the Lord hath indignation for ever*"-[Malachi 1:3-4].

In the Bible, God has expressed his purposes for both Houses of Israel as a total singular race. One of God's purposes in giving the statutes and judgements to Israel is expressed in Deut. 4:6,

"Keep therefore and do them, for this is your wisdom in the sight of the nations, which shall hear of all these statutes, and say, 'Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people', For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon Him for, and what nation is there so great that hath statutes and judgements so righteous as I set before you this day"?

This verse demonstrates again the separation of Israel from other races, and also one of the purposes God has for Israel.

If we try to say there are no differences in God's sight, then we are unlikely to discern any answers. First of all we must believe God's word, relentlessly consistent as it is. We are told, "*By their fruits ye shall know them*". We read about "good trees" and "corrupt trees" in Matt. 7:18 and Jesus says that it is impossible for a corrupt tree to ever bring forth good fruit. "*Karpōs*" = good means it is intrinsically good. We have to agree or to disagree with Jesus that these differences exist. Fruit is the product of the tree and it bears the same seed as the original tree. The seed in the fruit will produce the same type of tree again!

When the Apostle Paul proclaimed the Message, "*as many as were ordained to eternal life believed*"-[Acts 13:48]. What about those who were not so ordained? What was the basis of being ordained before they believed? In scripture we have those who God "foreknew", that is the same people as He "knew" in the Old Testament. Rom. 11:2 confirms this, "*God has not cast*

away His people which He foreknew". Foreknown and foreordained are the same word. Jesus was foreordained, "before the foundation of the world"-[1 Peter 1:20], so the time of being "known" was back in the past; so with Israel.

QUESTION TWENTY-EIGHT.

SHOULD WE BE TEACHING THAT GOD IS GRACIOUS TO EVERYONE OR RATHER THAT "GOD WILL BE GRACIOUS TO WHOM HE WILL BE GRACIOUS" THUS AGREEING WITH GOD THAT HE IS INDEED SOVEREIGN?

Romans 9:18. *"Therefore hath He mercy upon whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth".*

God does what He wants. So, is He really gracious to everyone of every race? We are told about the Potter who makes one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour, and about vessels "fitted for destruction" and a different lot of vessels "afore prepared for glory". It is the Potter who fashions the vessels from the raw materials before they have done either good or evil. Paul asks who we think we are to argue with God?-[Rom. 9:20]. Yet denominations still think God is wrong and want to argue this!

To those who say, "All is now of grace to everyone of every race", listen to the much-loved writings of the well known author Selwyn Hughes in "Every Day With Jesus", in the daily reading for 17th February 1994:

"The word 'grace' is unquestionably the most significant single word in the Bible, I agree. But it must be understood right away that grace is a characteristic of God which is exercised only towards those who are seen as having a special relationship with Him. Nowhere in the Bible is the grace of God ever mentioned in connection with mankind generally, though some theologians frequently use the term 'common grace' [a term not mentioned in the Bible] -the idea that God gives a special form of grace to the whole of mankind which restrains them from being as bad as they could be..

The other day I came across a writer who said, "The creation of the universe was an exercise of grace". I understand that he might have been using the word 'grace' as a synonym for love, [a mistake often made by Christian writers],but strictly speaking the exhibition of grace is reserved for the elect....."

Selwyn Hughes then quotes Arthur W. Pink as saying:

"Grace is the sole source from which flows the goodwill, love and salvation of God unto His chosen people".

Quoting from "The Best of Spurgeon", Pages 62-3,

"Why should not Jesus Christ have the right to choose His own bride?"

"You must first deny the authenticity and full inspiration of scripture before you can legitimately deny election".

"Whatever may be said about the doctrine of election, it is written in the Word of God with an iron pen, there is no getting rid of it. To me it is one of the sweetest and most blessed truths in the whole revelation, and those who are afraid of it are so because they do not understand it. If they could but know that the Lord had chosen them, it would make their hearts dance for joy".

The popular way of dealing with this is to say that the "fruit" are spiritual manifestations apart from anything else. We just cannot change the racial basis of election; the New Covenant opportunity being given to both Houses of Israel-[Heb. 8:8]. We cannot say the Bible is not racist. The mechanism for bringing the other races into subjection is by them witnessing God's blessing upon Israel as Israel obeys God. The principle shown by Jesus is when others witness "that ye have love for one another". When Paul took a contribution from Macedonia it was for the "poor saints" at Jerusalem, not for all and sundry of the poor. Denominations like to extend this beyond the context of "yourselves" because they think that "yourselves" means all races. So feeding the hungry and foreign aid is extended beyond the purposes of God.

In the end, the word of the Lord TO ISRAEL [Mal.1:1] and to THE SONS OF JACOB [Mal. 3:6] is "That they shall be mine, saith the Lord of Hosts, in that day when I make up My jewels -[Mal.3:17]. This is not addressed to any but those of Jacob/Israel who become sons. No one can spiritualise "ben", the word for genetic sons. Have a look through the scriptures and see who these "peculiar", "special" jewels are. Psalm 135:4 says, "For the Lord hath chosen **Jacob** for Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure" ..[or jewels]. In the New Testament they are still the same holy, separate, elect, precious, peculiar people.

QUESTION TWENTY-NINE.

HOW CAN IT BE INFERRED THAT THERE ARE TWO PROPHETICAL STREAMS, ONE FOR ISRAEL AND ONE FOR NON-ISRAEL, WHEN THERE IS IN FACT ONLY ONE PROPHETICAL STREAM?

If there were two streams of prophecy, one for Israel and one for non-Israel, a mixing, or a natural Israel and a spiritual Israel, or for both "The Church" and "Israel" as in the popular presentation, all would be there. The popular concept of a natural and a spiritual Israel does not exist. As God says He will do nothing without revealing it to His servants the prophets, any change would be found written in the prophets. When God "placed" [=yanach] Adam in the garden it was isolated to him. *Yanach* is used very often isolating one person or group. e.g Is. 14:1 "I will have mercy upon Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set [yanach] them in their own land". We cannot pretend that this means that God will place people of every race each in this particular land that was promised to the fathers of Israel, even if popular or orthodox Christianity likes to say so, [or otherwise to say the land is heaven]. They do this because the separation is now supposed to be by belief only

for all races, ignoring "seeds' seed and childrens' children". The popular concept of "the church" cannot be found in the prophets. We must be prepared to not go beyond what is "*fitly framed*" -[Eph.2]- in the Cornerstone with the foundation of the apostles and prophets, because scripture [the Old Testament] cannot be broken. Jesus says so!

QUESTION THIRTY.

COULD ASPECTS OF ORTHODOX CHRISTIANITY BE CONSIDERED TO BE CULTISH?

It is necessary to look at something that might sound heretical to many at first.

Could orthodox christianity be cultish?

Could orthodox christianity be something that refuses to accept all the Word of God? [Primarily from the pre-conditioning of tradition, not necessarily from insincerity].

Is the "*Go into all the world*" doctrine as generally taught really based on the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets, or on valid interpretation of both Testaments? It certainly does not reflect the "*As ye go preach, saying, the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*".

Has orthodox Christianity a wrong slant because it will not believe the prophetic words of Jacob and Moses for Israel in the "last days"? Jesus says that if any will not believe Moses, they cannot understand His words. In Luke 16:31 Jesus goes further and says people would never be persuaded to believe even if one rose from the dead. Believing Moses and the prophets is essential. For this reason alone, many churchgoers can not understand Jesus' words because they will not accept the authority of Moses and the prophets. This is a significant and important issue!

If the "*all the world*" universalist doctrine is wrong, then that belief is cultish. This is so even if Martin Luther confirmed what he was brought up to believe and introduced it into Protestantism and most have followed it since. This one belief is the source of conflict which undermines faith, but it is wrongly inferred "it is what every Christian must believe or he is not a Christian".

The wrong doctrine is summed up in the generalised belief, "*Jesus died to save the world*" and it arises from, "*Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature*", and "*God so loved the world*"- These are said to be the best known and the best loved verses in Christendom, but as the "all", "world" and "every creature" are taken wrongly, then Rome has originated the greatest fraud of all time.

Part of this fraud is inferring that 'Israel' and 'The Jews' are synonyms. This is false for many reasons. ["Jew" and "The Jews" do not have the same meaning in the New Testament]. "Jews" is a multi-racial term. It is a lie to say that having a belief makes every one of that belief into a race! It is common to hear people referring to "Jews" when talking about "Israel" in the Old Testament. In the Old Testament the word relates to Judah as part of Israel. Jesus came to save His People from their sins. They were already His people. The gospel is for "the transgressions of my people"-[Is.53:8].

QUESTION THIRTY-ONE

[1] ARE ALL RACES ALL THE SAME IN GOD'S SIGHT IN EVERY WAY?

[2] WHY IGNORE THAT SCRIPTURE DISCRIMINATES BETWEEN "MAN AND MAN" AND "MEN AND WOMEN".

Early in Genesis we find the "*seed of the woman*" and the "*seed of the serpent*", so no one can claim these two co-existing seeds are the same. Prophetically this goes through to the New Covenant era-[Gen. 3:15]. Through the Old Testament, we find different words for "man, "men" and "mankind", but there are four main different words in Hebrew namely '*adam*'-[579 times], '*enowsh*'-[567 times], '*yish*'-[1,713 times], and '*am*'-1789 times. There are places where two or three of these words for man are referred to in the one verse, thus showing comparisons, e.g.:

Ps.8:4 "*What is man [enowsh] that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man [Adam] that thou visitest him*".

Ps 90:3 "*Thou turnest man [Enowsh] to destruction; and sayest, return ye children of men [Adam]*".

God is mindful or marks the '*Enowsh*' man, but He visits [*paqad*] the '*Adam*' man. We do not find '*enowsh*' as being God's flock. Ezek. 34:31 says, "*And ye my flock, the flock of my pasture are Adam, and I am your God, saith the Lord*". But, in Proverbs 28:5 we read "...'*Enowsh* understand not judgement". With so many references to contrast these three words we should have enough to indicate a conclusion and to admit that there are differences.

It is not popular to divide the Word of God in the New Testament when it comes to "man", "men" and "mankind", but the distinctions remain. The majority words are '*aner*'-[212 times], '*tis*'-[969 times], '*anthropos*'-[560 times] and '*laos*'-143 times. In John 10 we can read about Jesus saying that some there were His sheep and also that others were "not of My sheep". Jesus says, "*I give My life for the sheep*". He went looking for the lost sheep, but it is not recorded that He went looking for other than "sheep". Denominations do not accept this limitation by Jesus claiming that things have changed somehow later in the New Testament. Jesus says, "*Every plant which my Heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up*:-[Matt15:14], and so we have to admit that there are those planted by God and those not planted by God. In the New Testament we still find there are the good seed and the bad seed. The good seed are the children of the Kingdom-[Matt.13:38]. All of Abraham's seed are not children of the Kingdom-[John 8:33-37]. Seeds are either good or bad as seeds before they have grown or done anything. The popular evangelical teaching is that it is not the nature of God to treat one racial seed differently than another, and so they claim that God plants any one of any race in the garden, making planting a matter solely one of belief, not origin as well. When did God's eternal nature change? Who plants the Tares and what is their end? So who, is right, Jesus or the churches? There are people described and also symbolised as "beasts" in both Testaments. Looking in another

direction, the word *aner* for "men" is never used of women, but it is not the scope here to go into all the details. People who believe that "mankind" always includes women must have difficulty with, "*Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with womankind*". There are areas in both Testaments where God discriminates between women and men. Modern Christians do not think that a sovereign God should discriminate between "men" and "men" or men and women. In the creation story, we cannot remain honest if we try to say that "created" = *bara'* is the same as "formed" = *yatsar*. [The same goes for *plasso* and *ktizo* in the New Testament]. We have men and women, 'Adam in the plural, being created [*bara'*] in Gen.1 before the 'Adam [singular] who was formed [*yatsar*] in Gen.2. "Created" and "formed" have differing meanings. From the sequence alone there is no way Genesis 2 could be a re-run of Genesis 1. On a weight of evidence basis, there is more to say that Adam [as we use the word] was the first spiritual man, but not the first biological man. In other words, God took one man from Genesis 1 and breathed into him the breath of life. Eve was the "*mother of all living*" with God's breath, not of the others. This indicates that there are those with the Spirit, and those "*having not the Spirit*"-[Jude V19]. The latter is the "*natural man*" who cannot receive the things of God-[1 Cor.2:14], but he may become very religious. What we believe about these issues in Genesis conditions what we believe right through the Bible.

We will not expand racial issues such as mixed bloods, incest blood or bastards as shown for instance in Deut. 23:2-8, "*A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord until THE TENTH GENERATION*". With Ammonites and Moabites this ten-generation prohibition is to be maintained "for ever". Israel was told, "*Thou shalt not seek their peace, nor their prosperity all thy days FOR EVER*". With Shemites such as Edomites and Egyptians a regeneration period by mating back into Israelite stock takes only **THREE GENERATIONS**-[Deut. 23:7-8]. Up to the end of this period there is no access for them to the tabernacle. With the Canaanite we read in Zechariah 14:21 about the end of the age, "*In that day there shall NO MORE be any Canaanite in the house of the Lord of Hosts*". This shows an objective and some take this to mean that no measure of Canaanite blood is ever acceptable. This then would include that section of mixed-race Jewry which descended from Judah's Canaanite wife-[Gen. 38:3], i.e. Shelah-Judah which are called Jews in 2 Kings 16:6, and who can be traced in the New Testament. These comparisons show striking differences in treatment between some races in the Bible.

God says He has war with Amelek [one of Esau's descendants] for all generations and that Israel was to "*blot out the remembrance of Amelek from under heaven*"-[Ex. 17:15 and Deut.25:19]. This is about the extermination of a particular race! Edom [also known as Idumea etc.] are stated to be "*The people against whom the Lord hath indignation for ever*"-[Mal 1:4]. This race whom God says He hates are the enemy of Israel "*for all generations*" until they are destroyed at the second coming of Jesus. Beyond these few races, the Bible does not mention the balance of races by name, and so no one has any right to presume anything about their destiny. The Bible does not state that they are condemned, but there are indications that most have benefit from, and should obey, the Laws of God. At the end, in the Book of Revelation, the New Jerusalem has the names of the Twelve Tribes of Israel upon its gates. Zechariah chapter 14 presents the picture about the place of the other races. Certain other races will bring their worship to the New Jerusalem year by year, but they are not in the city. God discriminates racially up to the end of the age, and these things demonstrate the racial differences that are in the Bible. We have to either agree or disagree with Jesus when He says that the scriptures "cannot be broken"-[John 10:35]. The Old Testament discrimination cannot be broken; we have to believe this if we are to agree with Jesus.

Reference is often heard about "*God's chosen people or race*" suggesting wrongly that this is "The Jews". If some are "chosen", then all the others must be "unchosen". Scripture does not indicate that "The Jews" are Israel, despite the popular suggestion. Judaism has been multi-racial since Bible days!

Three quotes from Jewish sources may personally help those who have been led to believe that the word "Jews" always relates to Israelites.

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 Yahweh's people would be found in the Islands of the sea".

These Islands are shown to be North and West of Palestine, i.e. the United Kingdom. The reader will probably be Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, or Nordic, whom can be shown to be Israelites apart from the white Japhethic and Edomic content -[Genesis 9:27 and 16:12], and obvious foreigners, who have moved in amongst them. In the Divine foreknowledge, true Israelite posterity possesses the inherent characteristics with which God purposed should be used to bring peace to the world and the casting down of demonic strongholds over the other races under the righteous rule of Jesus Christ.

QUESTION THIRTY-TWO.

IF THE JEWS ARE THE NATURAL PEOPLE OF GOD, AND IF THE CHURCH ARE THE HEAVENLY PEOPLE OF GOD, THEN WHAT WERE THE PEOPLE BEFORE ABRAHAM?

QUESTION THIRTY-THREE.

IF WE ARE FOUND TO HAVE BEEN PREACHING "ANOTHER GOSPEL", WHAT ARE WE GOING TO DO ABOUT IT?

Only one of these two gospels as set out below can be right.

GOSPEL NUMBER ONE.

This is that gospel which cannot be found throughout the Law, The Psalms, the Prophets, or through the New Testament. 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].
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 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", not "all men" of Israel.
10. All races are pre-destined -[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. Everyone is the same now.
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" 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].
16. 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.

THIS GOSPEL 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 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).

This is the everlasting gospel, the true gospel in which you stand, if you continue in "The Faith". This says:

1. God does not say anywhere that He loves all mankind, but only His elect nation.
2. Jesus came for those chosen from before the "*foundation of the world*" -[which means the "overthrow of the order"].
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*". Jesus prayed for "them which Thou gavest Me", not everyone else as well.
4. It is the gospel of grace.... "*And I will be gracious to whom I will...*"
5. It is not of ourselves, it is the gift of God.
6. God is merciful to whom He will-[Rom.9:18].
7. The Sons [*huios*] of God are adopted out of the Children [*teknon*] of Israel, not out of others.
8. The Potter makes different vessels, according to His purposes-[Rom 9:21].
9. The gift is given only to the elect, through regeneration and efficacious calling of God.
10. Jesus is the Redeemer of Israel [both Houses only].