



# Christian Identity Ministries

PO Box 146, CARDWELL QLD 4849, Australia

Ph: 07-4066 0146 Fax: 07-4066 0226 (International 61-7 instead of 07)

"Blessed be the LORD God of *Israel*; For He hath visited and redeemed *His* people, And hath raised up and horn of salvation for *us* in the house of his servant David; as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began; That *we* should be saved from *our* enemies and from the hand of all that hate *us*; to perform the mercy promised to *our* fathers and to remember his holy covenant; The oath which he swore to *our* father Abraham, That he would grant unto *us*, that *we* being delivered out of the hand of *our* enemies might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of *our* lives." Luke 1:68-75; the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic-Germanic-Scandinavian people are *ISRAEL!*

#186

Newsletter

September AD2001

## BRITISH-ISRAEL CREED CONTRADICTIONS

by Arnold Kennedy

### Introduction

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

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

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

In such statements of belief we can see contradictions, and as we look further into these contradictions, we will see that the primary error comes from trying to merge the national message of the Bible with traditional religious beliefs, (which introduces the idea of internationalism). In looking into such contradictions, there is no intent to deny the primary meaning of what the term "British-Israel" means. There is obviously an attempt being made by some British-Israel leadership, and some of their writers, to try to marry up what might be termed "The Exclusiveness of Israel," (the book of this title is available from CIM for \$18.75), with traditional religious-universalism. These leaders have the idea that God's purpose for Israel is "to save the world." Nationalistic and the internationalist views are in direct conflict, and they arise primarily because of the wrong view that is taken of phrases such as "all men" which is made to mean "all mankind in general," rather than "all men of the context" in which it is found. The same applies to the phrase, "the world," where which "world" referred to

should be determined by the underlying Greek word and the context. This translation-context approach will stand any grammatical or language-usage test, whereas the religious-traditional view creates contradictions throughout the Bible.

### A FURTHER LOOK INTO BRITISH-ISRAEL CREED-STATEMENTS

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

(4a) WE BELIEVE that in the matter of personal salvation there is no distinction of race. All races are dependent upon the saving grace of the Lord Jesus.

(4b) WE BELIEVE in the Gospel of Grace (Eph. 2:1-8), which is the Gospel of Salvation to all men.

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

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

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

### IN THIS ISSUE:

British-Israel Creed Contradictions, Kennedy.....	1
Tapes of The Month .....	2
Loan Camp Videos Available .....	4
New Tapes .....	6
Featured Book - Dedicated Disciples .....	8
Adam or Adams - Which Came First? Adam de Witt ...	11
Neighbor & Brother, Paul de Witt .....	13
Answering Service, Lake of Fire .....	13
Schools Wage Quiet War Undermining Family Values.	14
Dead Doctors Don't Lie .....	14

The views and opinions expressed in the articles herein or herewith are those of the authors and not necessarily those of CIM. They are written by fallible men. You must ask Jesus to guide your studies!

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

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

**(5b) WE BELIEVE that personal salvation by faith in the atonement of Jesus Christ is necessary for all, Israelite, Jew and Gentile (Rom 3:22-25). Each one must be born again (John 3:1-7). To confess Christ, who died that sinful men might live, is individually supreme above all else (Matt 10:32-33. Rom 10:9-13).**

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

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

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

In Deut 14:2 we read, "For thou art an holy people unto the LORD thy God, and the LORD hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth." How dare anyone presume they can put Israel and everybody else in the same category as each other, when God has stated precisely the opposite. Note that the above verse is a racial statement, and there are many such racial statements! No other races were in Israel's elect position at any time and therefore "reconciliation" can never be

applied to races other than Israel. In the pattern given in the Old Testament, reconciliation is in the context of Israel only (see Ezekiel 45:17, "to make reconciliation for the house of Israel"), and in the New Testament, Hebrews 2:17 says, "Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people," i.e. Israel in context. We can confirm "Israel" because "the brethren" who are reconciled are people of the same kin (adelphos = kinsmen of the womb), and thus we must take note that the High Priest's office was, and is still, only for Israelites. In the other Scriptures given in (5a), (5b) and (5c) above, Jesus was speaking to Israelites only. Check that for yourself - it is not that difficult!

In (5b) it is claimed that, "Israelite, Jew and Gentile must be born again." This is a classic example of changing and adding to the Word of God. The statement is an utter impossibility since the Greek tense of "born again"

is simply not Future tense as a religious tradition claims. We must note that it is the translators who presented this passage as "Except a man be born again," whereas the Greek says, "Except a man may have been begotten from above" where "from above" refers to the mechanism of their past conception, not a future impossibility. Children are "begotten" by men and are later "born" of women. No one can be "begotten" after he is "born." The Scriptures insist that God is the father of Israel; that He begat them, and so unless a person is begotten from the line of God's children, he cannot come to "see" the Kingdom of God. It was Nicodemus who used the

word "again" (=deuteros = "a second time"), not Jesus. Jesus berated Nicodemus for his lack of understanding and He used the word "anothen" (= "from above"), an expression which refers to the 'rock' from which Israel was hewn, that is, Abraham-(please see Isaiah 51:1).

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

## TAPES OF THE MONTH

**#A-7211 (a) Warning of Judgment.** A sermon on the message carried to those in political office.

**(b) We Need a Christian Government.** To obey as a nation, we MUST have Christian men in national offices.

**#A-7214 (a) Dwell Together in Unity.** Psalm 133. Christians should try to live near other Christians! This is most important.

**(b) Let Us be Bold Christians.** Prov 28:1. Christian boldness built the early church in the N.T. and in early America. Here is how to be bold today.

**This Month Only! sug don \$8 the two**



*nos* which means “nations.” (‘Gentiles’ is also used for translating the Greek word, *hellen* which means “Greek.”) Quite clearly *ethnos* (nations) and *Hellen* (Greek) have very different meanings, but they can both be used when referring to Israelites in the first 100 years after the crucifixion.

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

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

The “Bill of Divorcement” God gave to the House of Israel, is partly what the redemption and restoration is about. The great price Jesus paid was related to that event. The “husband” had to die, “*that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God*” - [Rom 7:4] [CIM: No, the ‘husband’ didn’t have to die, Israel had to die - but Jesus died in her place!!] The fact that God divorced the House of Israel only, confuses some people as to why the House of Judah was treated differently, but that aside, the point is that no other race was subject to a divorce.

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

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

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

Having mentioned “*the gospel of grace*” and “*the gospel of salvation,*” this mention of “*the gospel of the Kingdom*” is the third “gospel” in the British-Israel creed-statements. The creed writers do not understand these terms. When we consider Acts 1:6, “*When they therefore*

*were come together, they asked of him, saying, Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?*,” We can understand easily that this is speaking about a physical kingdom. This kingdom has to have a King, subjects, land, and laws, in order to be a kingdom. It is referring to the Kingdom of God over Israel! How can the kingdom be restored to any other race?

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

**(8) “WE BELIEVE in God - the God of the Bible (Exodus 3:4-14).**

This is potentially another rather vague statement, but at least they give us a reference point. In verse 6 of this passage we find the definition of God’s scope of interest: (6) *Moreover he said, I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.* (7) *And the LORD said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt,* (9) *Now therefore, behold, the cry of the children of Israel is come unto me:* (10) *Come now therefore, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh, that thou mayest bring forth my people the children of Israel out of Egypt.* (13) *And Moses said unto God, Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them? (14) And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.*

The God of the Bible here, as elsewhere, is “*the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,*” not the God of all races. In v7 and v10 we find certain people described as “*My people,*” (i.e. Israel), so no others come into this. In v10 and v14 the people concerned are “*the Children of Israel.*”

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

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

What do British-Israelites mean by the term “*mankind*” in “*Saviour of mankind*” and of “*our*” as in “*our human nature*”? Are they really every race? The use of the word “*mankind*” again suggests the humanistic “brotherhood of man” doctrine, which is not found in

## ELECTIONS:

Free Book Answers ALL Your Questions!

The Electoral Pocket Book is a free booklet (182) pages produced by the Australian Electoral Commission. It is an excellent resource on all matters relating to Federal elections, current members, votes at the last election for every division, and statistics for every election for the last 100 years. Phone the Electoral Commission on 132326 and ask for a copy of the “Electoral Pocket book” as well as a copy of the “Federal Electoral Boundaries Map” to be posted to you.



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

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

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

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

The “restoration of all things” (= *apokastasis*) concerns rectifying the sin of Adam. “All creation” in Romans 8:21 again concerns only the “children of God,” and is about the “redemption of the body,” this being the hope of Israel. The context refers to only those who are “children of God,” that is, Israel. The erroneous “adoption” pertains to Israel only as we read in Romans 9:4, “*Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption* (correctly: ‘placing as sons’). [read Sheldon Emry’s **WHO ARE ISRAELITES**, # 140 @ \$2.00] All the “placing as sons” verses concern only Israel - (see Rom 8:15-23, Rom 9:4, Gal 4:5 and Eph 3:5)

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

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

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

belief and you have to answer that question yourself.

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

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

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

### **HOW DID THESE CONTRADICTIONS ARISE?**

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

The fundamental source of the errors is the English translations. In the case of the AV (KJV), the biggest problem was caused by the explicitly stated plan that the translation would use as many words as possible from the English language so that no-one could accuse them of discriminating against any word or group of words. The next significant source of error is that all the main English translations and most of the lesser-known ones were funded by religious organizations.

Which religious body is going to translate itself out of existence by writing what the Greek text actually says? But it does not end there. The biggest difficulty of all was that the Anglo-Saxon translators, being descendants of Israel, could feel the inherent tug of truth in what they were translating. But because Israel was nationally blind to its own identity, they could not understand how they could be a part of this wonderful book that seemed to be directed at Israelites rather than Englishmen. So they resorted to vagaries and uncertainties and generalisations because it helped them feel that they could somehow participate themselves. A tragic case of reverse discrimina-

### **LOAN VIDEOS AVAILABLE!**

A full set of Camp Videos (2001 camp) is now available ON LOAN. See the messages being delivered, and come on the day-trip outing to the Atherton Tableland. Enjoy the singing and performances of the concert items. Loan the full set of 7 tapes for a maximum period of one month! **Suggested LOAN donation \$15 the set!** or if you wish you may have the full set for only \$50



tion, brought on by their own and the nation's ignorance. And the end result are the seriously flawed creed-statements we saw in (2)-(12) above, and in the literature they spawned.

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

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

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

### WHERE DO WE FIND 'ISRAEL' TODAY?

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

1. From Alfred M. Lilienthal's book "What Price Israel." "Here's a paradox, an anthropological fact, many Christians have more Hebrew-Israelite blood in their veins than their Jewish neighbours."

2. The Jewish author Yair Davidy in his book "The Tribes - Israelite Origins of Western Peoples" [Foreword by Rabbi A. Field] tells in much detail that *the Saxon folks are Israel!*

3. Jewish author Harry Golden wrote in 1967, "Isaiah the prophet wrote that the remnant of Yahweh's people would be found in the Islands of the sea." (the word 'islands' as used in Isaiah, #339 in Strong's, means a *habitable spot - as desirable- coasts or islands*)[i.e. coastlands of north-western Europe]

These islands can be shown as being North and West of Palestine, i.e. the United Kingdom [and Europe]. The British Isles have been settled predominantly by the Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, and Nordic people, as distinct from the white Japhetic, Ishmaelite and Edomite peoples [Genesis 9:27 and 16:12], and the obvious foreigners, who have moved into Britain over the years. Essentially they are what we refer to today as being "Caucasian," that is, they originated from

Caucasia where the House of Israel went into captivity. From thence their prophesied migration Westward can be traced historically through Europe, into Britain.

As Israel is the "chosen" race, then all the others must be "not chosen" for God's purpose. Reference is often made to "God's chosen people or race," suggesting wrongly that "The Jews" equates to all of Israel. Despite the popular suggestion, Scripture does not indicate that "The Jews" (originally a contraction from 'Judeans') are Israel. **Judaism has been a multi-racial religion since the days following the Babylonian captivity!** "The Jews" are not a singular race and they readily admit it themselves! The Encyclopedia Judaica declares that "Modern Jewry is Edom," thus the Jews confirm that the descendants of Esau mainly represent modern Jewry. And, Jesus always condemned "The Jews" for what they were [see John chapter 8]. The Jews' [plural and as a popular term] cannot be Israel! Jesus said that these people (the Judean leaders) could not hear the Word of God, and that it was not given unto them to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven - [Matt 13:11]! The terms 'Jew' and 'Jews,' refers to the Edomite dominated people of the

Judean nation that existed from the time following the Babylonian captivity until 135 AD. These terms are never applicable to the house of Judah. The terms "Greek" and "Greeks" refer to the dispersed 12 tribes of the House of Israel located in Asia Minor in the period after the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities until approximately 100 AD. Paul's phrase, "And so shall all Israel be saved" refers to the

former two kingdoms, the House of Israel (the Northern Kingdom) and the House of Judah (the Southern Kingdom). Both houses, despite their different captivities are both saved by Jesus' sacrifice. At the time Paul was speaking, it applied to the Israelites in the Judean nation (descendants of the 60,000 who returned to rebuild the Temple) as well as the Israelites of the Dispersion in Asia Minor.

Romans 11:26, "And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness **from Jacob**: For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins."

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

### END NOTE

Some excerpts and the appendixes in this paper are taken from "The Exclusiveness of Israel" [available from CIM #714 @ \$18.75] This paper does not address God's purpose in choosing a special people for Himself, or how the other races relate to this purpose. For information on this topic, please see "Is Israel a Servant Race to 'Save The World'?" [Newsletter #184 June/Jul 2001]

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

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

The Bible also records the struggle between Israel and

### COMING SOON!

New stock of **IN THE IMAGE OF GOD** which was previously out of print, is again available. Reserve your copy now!

#324 @ sug don \$8.85

Those waiting on ordered CD's, please be patient. We are awaiting back orders and hope they will be here soon. They will be posted to you as soon as they arrive! THANKS.



every adversary, person, group or situation that would seek to pollute or to destroy that one race (situations brought about by God as punishment on His people).

## APPENDIXES

### ARE "ALL," "EVERY," "WHO-SOEVER," ETC LIMITED EXPRESSIONS?

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

"all" the one [group], or "the whole" of the class, or "the entire" of the class.

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

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

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

1. They are all consistent statements of fact, [not inferences].
2. They all relate to Israel alone, as a race, no other race being included.
3. Israel alone is God's inheritance.
4. There is no conflict about redemption applying to Israel alone.
5. That certain covenants and promises referred to were made only with Israel.
6. That Israel is a holy, i.e. set-apart, race - [What is commonly called The Chosen Race].
7. That the Statutes [choq] and the Judgments [mishpat] were given to Israel alone as a servant nation.
8. That the word "Jews" is not mentioned in any of these Scriptures.
9. That there are different "seeds," and that Abraham's

seed is a descendency.

10. That none of these Scriptures can be 'spiritualised.'

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

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

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

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

Consider again these two verses: John 3:16 *God so loved the world ...* and Mark 16:15 *Go ye into all the world..*

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

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

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

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

This is the *creature* [or rather, *creation*] of Mark 16:15. The word *ktisis* in the Greek is used to indicate the product of human building or formation. In this context it refers to a village, or place where people live. A *ktisis* is built by man, not God. The disciples were to go specifically to the places or the villages where the Israelites lived. Matt 10:23 - "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man be come". We cannot make the cities of Israel mean the cities of every race. Note here that Jesus is speaking of the time of the end.

What is the area of proclamation? Is it not the world of Israel? - What were they proclaiming? Was it not the Gospel of the Kingdom?

The Kingdom is what Jesus and John the Baptist came proclaiming *repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand*. Who proclaims that today? It is impossible to believe and teach both the modern universal gospel to all races and the



exclusive Kingdom of Heaven at the same time. Jesus confines *all the world* to the cities of Israel! In other words, it is to be proclaimed in the dwellings or places where the Israelites live right up to the end of the age.

### SO WHICH WORLD DID GOD "SO LOVE"?

Does all mankind belong to that "world"?  
Do only certain men belong to that "world"?  
Who are those people then that God loves?  
Where do they come from?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### GO INTO ALL 'THE WORLD,' AND 'WHAT DOES 'THE WORLD' MEAN'?

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

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

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

[a] It does not mean every race or the inhabited earth [*oikoumene*]. Nor does it mean the landmass of the earth or its soil [*ge and ghay*].

[b] Its prime meaning is "order," "arrangement" or "beauty," but never the common multiracial meaning as taught.

[c] It often means that particular world which is being spoken about, to the exclusion of other "worlds". In English we speak of the "world of music" - in Greek we would say the *kosmos of music*. (or the "world of sport." etc.)

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

[e] *Kosmos* is used of the Roman Empire [John 8:23].

[f] *Kosmos* is used of the world that was before the flood (2 Peter 2:5). That world was destroyed (Heb. 11:7).

[g] *Kosmos* is spoken of, not only as the world that now is, but also of that which is to come (do we preach to the world to come?).

[h] It can refer to things other than people, for example, the adornment of a woman's hair (see 1 Tim 2:9 where *kosmos* is translated as "modest"). It is particularly difficult to proclaim the gospel to a woman's hair clip!

[i] *Kosmos* is used of many other things and these can include either order or disorder, fame and honour, the orderly universe, the stars in the universe and even heaven!

So, which "world" of all these "worlds" did God *so love*? From the Scriptures, we can see that there are differing kinds of "worlds." Think about this and how this relates to what we see written in the Law, the Psalms and

### NEW VIDEO

#CI-311 Propaganda & The Third Reich  
**THE HOLOCAUST AND MIND CONTROL - Part B.** (tape 4, last of the set of 4)  
Continues the examination of the Holocaust story. Documents that many of the "facts" and "figures" universally accepted - and unchallenged - for many years fall apart when put to the acid test of close examination. These revelations have been suppressed by the establishment media "for fear of the Jews." Also contains footage of Palestinian genocide at the hands of Israeli soldiers.  
66 minutes, sug don \$25.00 posted



the Prophets. In the Old Testament we are told that God loved Israel. There does not seem to be a single reference to God loving any other race. Let us consider the Israel order (*kosmos*) that God says He loved in the Old Testament.

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

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

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

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

Hosea 11:14 “*When Israel was a child, then I loved him ... I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love:”*

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

Malachi 1:2 “*Yet I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau,”*

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

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

**Pair One:** John 7:7 “*The world cannot hate you, but me it hateth.*”

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

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

**Pair Two:** John 17:6 “*I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world.*”

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

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

**Pair Three:** John 17:9 “*I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me, for they are thine.*”

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 must pray for one “world” and not for another!

### THE WORLD - “KOSMOS” OR “OIKOUMENE”?

These two words are both translated “world,” but they are different in application and meaning. The meaning of *kosmos* is determined by its context to identify which particular world is under discussion, whereas *oikoumene* means the inhabited or civilised earth, such as that of the Mediterranean region of that time. We can see *oikoumene* easily in verses such as Luke 2:1 where Caesar was to tax *all the world* and Acts 11:28 about a famine throughout *all the world*. In Acts 17:6 we read where the disciples *turned the*

*world upside down*. In Acts 19:27 we read about *all Asia and the world worshipping the goddess Diana* and in Acts 24:5 about Paul being said to be a *mover of sedition throughout the world*. In Rev 3:10 Jesus speaks about the *hour of temptation which shall come upon all the world*. In Romans 10:18 we are told the Word of God went *into all the earth and unto the ends of the world*. When we remember that both parts of Israel were scattered among the nations this is easily understood. We might say that the *kosmos* of Israel was scattered throughout the *oikoumene*. Jesus came into the *oikoumene* [Heb 1:6] to minister to the *kosmos* of Israel.

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

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

### DOES GOD SO LOVE THOSE HE DECLARES THAT HE HATES?

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

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

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

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

Scripture says, *Whosoever believeth on Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life*. We have to look at which “world” is being addressed and see that the “whosoever” refers to “all” of that part being spoken about and not “all” of everything. The context here is Israel. The *whoso-*

## Featured Book DEDICATED DISCIPLES

by Henry W. Stough #339 @ \$12.55

For many years I wondered what became of the disciples of Jesus after the end of the narratives found in the Holy Bible. From places here and there I could find some records and traditions concerning the Twelve Apostles, and of the Apostle Paul, but there was not such information about some of the lesser known people who knew Jesus. Then with the unfolding of the information concerning the wandering tribes of Israel, there came other information dealing with these leas know, but no less dedicated disciples of Jesus. They came to distant countries and to strange people. Ancient records and legends reveal the hardships, experiences, and suffering of these early missionary pioneers who planted the Faith in foreign countries. Fascinating reading !





ever is a mistranslation; it literally means *the entire one*, which refers to the entire nation of Israel, as determined by the context.

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

### JOHN CHAPTER THREE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The disciples were instructed specifically not to go to certain people. This is again shown in Acts 16:6, where the Apostles were forbidden of the holy ghost to preach the

word in Asia. The disciples of Jesus went out from Galilee knowing exactly where to find these "lost" sheep. They were not so "lost" that they could not be found! "Lost" has to do with God's people being set aside for Law transgression (put away and punished).

### THE TWO MOST MISAPPLIED VERSES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

One Scripture is said to be THE MOST LOVED Scripture in the Bible. The other is said to be THE MOST MOTIVATING Scripture in the Bible. These are the two verses:

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

Mark 16:15 "*And He said unto them, Go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.*" [The words, "the world" are emphasised because they are critical].

**Again another soul has departed to Rest in Peace. And again I ask, where is the next generation to carry on with spreading of the message that the departed were engaged in? Politically, you can expect the situation to only worsen continually, until the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic-Israelites are willing to repent and obey God's Law. Most don't even know it exists, let alone that it applies to them. Are you helping to tell them? Please encourage your children to read (books and newsletters) and listen (audio and video tapes), and tithe so that repentance and obedience will spread.**

Why should it be said that these are the two most misapplied verses in the New Testament? Why could we even call them troublesome? It is because they cut across the flow of all Scripture, and are used today to try to over-ride racial-origin differences presented in the Holy writ right back as far as Genesis 3:15, "*And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed.*" God placed this enmity there and there is no record anywhere of it being removed. Jesus reminds us of a similar action by God in the matter of the tares and the wheat, one of which cannot

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

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

It might seem to the pre-conditioned mind that it is impossible to mistranslate and impossible to misapply John 3:16 and Mark 16:15. To even suggest that there



might be a problem in these two verses would upset many people because of years of pre-conditioning.

## **THE TWO VIEWS TAKEN OF "THE WORLD" ARE TWO DIFFERING GOSPELS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There are no separate streams of prophecy for both "Jews and Gentiles" in the popular concept, but there are for "The House of Judah" and for "The House of Israel," as well as for prophecy for Israel as a whole. Every objection that can be made against the exclusiveness of Israel can easily be met on the foundation of the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets, and this is confirmed, by Jesus and the Apostles.

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

### **GOSPEL NUMBER ONE [The False Gospel]**

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

1. The Law and the Ten Commandments were given to every race, as a covenant.

2. Jesus gave His life so that He becomes the Redeemer of all races, to redeem them from the curse of that broken law, even if the other races did not have that covenant-law relationship.

3. God loves all men and every individual member of all the human races, including those God says that he hates.

4. The gospel is for all sinners of every race [not "the sinners of My people"-Amos 9:10 or "for the transgression of my people was he stricken"-Isa 53:8].

5. All are called. There are no Tares or Goats, despite what Jesus says to the contrary.

6. All are chosen. There are no inferior vessels, despite what Paul says to the contrary.

7. There are no Twelve Tribes of Israel any more - [even if they are found throughout the N.T.].

8. All men are supposed to have faith.-[the Bible says "all men have not faith"].

9. The Father gave Jesus to "all men" of all races, not "all men" of Israel.

10. All races are pre-destined with opportunity for salvation-[God must have been wrong to expect Israel to destroy certain mixed races. All are the same now it is suggested].

11. There are no elect people, not any election according to grace.

12. God has mercy on everyone, not just on whom He chooses or elects.

13. There are no scriptural differences between men of differing origins.

14. That "men" and "mankind" always includes women as well.

15. That non-Israel races can be "adopted" into Israel, ignoring, "Who are Israelites to whom pertaineth the adoption"-[Rom 9:4] and "of whom concerning the flesh Christ came."

16. God may be worshipped acceptably within any culture and religion; all being paths to God.

17. All races are the same in God's sight.

18. It is now up to all sinners of all races to embrace

### **STOCK REDUCTION**

This month only! one each of the following in a made up packet:

SPIRITS ON TRIAL (\$2.10)

THE POWER OF SUGGESTION (\$1.80)

GOD'S ANSWER TO WOMEN'S LIB

(The Woman's Bible) (\$1.70)

WAKE UP MILOSEVIC (\$1.25)

A SCRIPTURAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE RACE ISSUE (2.20)

the total value of this packet is \$9.05 you can have the packet this month for a sug don of \$5.00 posted! Order now.



the love of God or to not embrace it. It is up to everyone of every race to either have eternal life, or to perish.

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

#### GOSPEL NUMBER TWO -[The True Gospel]

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

1. The Bible does not say anywhere that God loves all mankind, but only the 'world' of His elect nation. Election is established before having done good or evil.

2. Jesus came for those chosen from before the "foundation of the world"-(Ten New Testament references).

3. Jesus is the Shepherd of the sheep only. He said, "I lay down my life for the sheep"-[John 10:15]. He did **not** add "for the goats and everyone else as well."

4. Jesus prayed for "them which Thou gavest Me," not every one else as well-[John 17:9].

5. Jesus came to save His People from their sins. They were already His People before they were saved. The gospel is for "the transgressions of my people"-[Isa 53:8].

6. It is the gospel of grace ... "And I will be gracious to whom I will..." -[Rom 9:18]. God does the choosing.

7. The gift is given only to the elect, through regeneration and efficacious calling of God.

8. Jesus is the Redeemer of Israel [both Houses only].

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

I feel this article would do well as a small booklet. Perhaps the previous one on *Is Israel a Servant Race to 'Save the World,'* as well. expressions of interest for these articles in booklet form would be appreciated. Remember, you should have a copy of **THE EXCLUSIVENESS OF ISRAEL**, to really delve into the nitty-gritty of this subject. Copies are still available from CIM for a sug. don. of \$18.75 posted #714 - order today!

## ADAM OR ADAMS - WHO CAME FIRST?

by Adam de Witt

(God willing this will be added, as a suggested last chapter in Lawrence Blanchard's latest book. But in case this does not happen, at least those reading it here will benefit from this. Adam )

The belief that the man (singular) - called Adam of Genesis 2, is the first man is the basis for the warped doctrine that all races are of this one man. This tradition stems from the folly of teaching that Genesis two is a recap of Genesis one. [in relation to this subject, you may be interested to know that we are again able to obtain IN THE IMAGE OF GOD #324, and copies are underway!]

I have not been brought up in traditional church doctrine. I was trained to read and study books in a logical (sequential) manner. So when I first began to study this 'issue' of Genesis; being trained in straight logic, I could see an ongoing account. There seemed to be no reason for any recap. Indeed, most of the text is free of recapping, and yet for some twisted reason, the churches taught Gen 2 to be a recap of Gen 1 when there is no such thing taking place; no reason and no hint of such.

The only reason it seems, for a recap is based on the weak excuse that there is a chapter split. So what?! The chapter splits were added in during the time of the translators in the N.T. Church Age and as such have no divine


inspirational claims whatsoever. Indeed, Bibles translated in other tongues (such as Dutch and German) have chapter and verse numbers which don't always tally with the English ones. However, for the sake of ease I will use the English chapter splits but only so that one can follow the logic put before you soon.

Before I start I will quote this old saying "Convince a man against his will and he'll be of the same thought still." So if you feel like switching off, then please do, I become no wealthier when you see that which I put to you. Are you sitting down? The case I thus set before you is this ..... Not only was (the) Adam of Genesis two white, he was not the first Adamite, let alone the first human! Genesis chapter 2 is simply an ongoing tale, flowing forth with details, adding upon with the new, not a nonsensical back-flip, for back-flips of this nature are not common place in the Holy Writ.

The recap theory is upheld by so many for no other reason than the sheer wish to do so. the orders of Creation in Genesis One do not line up or tally with those of Genesis Two, at all. Below I hope to make this clear with the following chart: ORDER OF CREATION

GENESIS ONE	GENESIS TWO
after light, heavens and seas	
we read:	
a) plants (grasses & fruit)	e) one singular Man, and no woman
b) the sun and stars	a) fruit trees & greens
c) fish and fowls	d) land creatures
d) land creatures	c) fowl
e) men and women (plural, at once and no time lapse between them).	e) one woman (singular).

When we break down the list into the alphabetical letters only, then the chart reads thus:



From this alone we can see that Genesis Two is most clearly **NOT** a recap of Genesis 1, they can not be likened for they do not tally!

As shown earlier in this book (Lawrence Blanchard's Did All Men Come From Adam?), Adam means, 'man who can blush.' "Man" is an ethnic term for a specie. The word "Man" does not mean one Male. "Man" without the definite articles, 'the,' or 'a' means the 'specie of humans.' Without the definite articles, "Man" is a plural word and is free of gender; it is both male and female-plural. Once we say 'A man' or 'the man,' then we are speaking of one (specific) male. Both men and women are Man. The plural of 'Man' is 'Man,' it is not mans or men. Men is the plural of 'a man.'

In Genesis 1:26, "..... Let us make Man in our likeness...." the account is saying, let us create the specie or kind or race of **man**; plural - males and females. Indeed, further on it says as if in the same breath "... let them," not him, "have dominion." "So God," Genesis 1:27, "created MAN (the specie plural) in his likeness, in the likeness of God created he him," (the word 'him' seems now to muddle the issue because we just read male and female; 'him' thus is used in the sense that 'she' is used for the church. Clearly the translators had a problem with



translating this and gave it the translation 'him' based largely upon their assumption of what they felt it ought to read.. Logically, one could deduce **'them.'** [Ferrar Fenton renders vs 27 as "So GOD created men under His own Shadow, creating them in the Shadow of GOD, and constituting **them** male and female." ] As the final (KJV) phrase states: "male and female created he **them**." Note if you will, both the words Male and Female here do not have definite articles, namely 'the,' or 'a,' so it does not read "... a male and a female created he them." Therefore, the text shows, **many** males and **many** females were made who were ruddy; namely as red earth, or 'Awdawm.'" (#120)

Genesis One, plural-Adam, came after a list of creations. Yet in Genesis Two we see that AN Adam was alone and he was followed by some creations before one lone woman is created. It is important to note that 'Adam' is a word, and not a name as such. Indeed, all names are only words. Names were traditionally given to show a trait the parents wished for their young. Like the North American Mongoloids (Indians) who called their young names like "Sitting Bull," or "Running Bear," Israelites and their forebears did likewise, with names such as 'Son-of-my-right-hand' (Benyamin), or "Might of God (OthniEL), or "Lightning" (Barak), or "Feller" (Gideon), and so on. Thus the **White Race** of Genesis One, **Man** plural, was named by its trait, Rudiness or 'Adam.'

The Man in Genesis 2 is the first man of the Adamic race to be a tiller of the (red) earth. This can have the meaning of a 'Bour' which shares the same root as does the Dutch word 'Boer.' "Bour" is the second half of the word "neigh-bour" (wrongly spelt neighbor, for 'bour' is a word, not simply a quaint sound to round off a word for the sake of it). 'Boer' means farmer [actually it is a contraction of 'Land**hou**wer, or a builder of or on land], but the hint is that farmers or Boers or Bours are 'Nigh' or 'Near', thus Kin or Brethren. The true English word for Ecclesia, Church or Community is thus 'Neigh**bour**hood.'

Tilling the earth is a 'blood' thing as well as a 'water' issue. One case is earthly (blood) the other is heavenly 'water.' That's why 'cleaning' was done by sprinkling both blood and water as a symbolic deed, of course. HRH Jesus' parables give a greater understanding of the thought of tilling. If Jesus was the 2nd Adam then Gen 2 Adam was the first Jesus. Jesus called for Fishers of Men, but also he called for sowers of good seed ... of men. The parables of the Tares and the Wheat show that 'bour-ing' (farming) was spoken of in an allegorical form. Men were the crops to be 'boured.' Tilling the earth means to make the world order ready for God's Kingdom, sow the good seed to reap a good harvest of men. HRH Jesus' job was to sow the good seed. That was Adam's job too. Jesus had a population to work with, so did the first 'Jesus' of Genesis 2. The Kingdom is like .... seeds falling on the way side, stony places, thorns, and in good earth, good adam (red earth). Who did this? The Son of Man (the son of Adam-plural)[Matt 13:57]

Adam of Genesis Two was not the father of man, but a Son of Man (Adam-plural) [he was 'the son of God' -Luk 3:38], like Jesus was too. Whereas however, Adam, the man,

failed in his tilling; Jesus did not. Adam the man, was called Adam because he was the Son of Man (Adam-plural), he represented them and bore all their racial traits, he was ruddy. A more befitting name than to be called after the folk he represented could not be given other than simply ...'Adam.'

Seeing that God changes not and he is the same (and of the same thoughts) today, tomorrow, and yesteryear; then God's stance on frowardness (perversion) would also be the same. Incest is sick, today, tomorrow and yesteryear; once and forever. Adam and Eve's children needed breeding stock lest they fall for the cursed frowardness of incest. Their children were not a bunch of sickos and nor were they the offspring of sickos. It is **madness** to say God allowed for it once. This is the same line of thought 'one blood' has, allowing for one-off's to back their doctrine, in their case, allowing for random or one-off evolutions to shape various races. One cannot go

against 'one blood' on this and then do likewise to uphold one's own stance on things not backed by the Holy Writ.

Genesis One gives us Adam the Race. Genesis Two gives us Adam the 'called-out-one'. The same name is used in the same way we have a tribe called Saxon and individuals of that tribe named Saxon (like the son of a friend of mine).

The reason why there is a different order of shapings in Genesis 2 compared to Genesis 1 should now be clear. Besides the Adams; the plants and creatures in Genesis 2 are related to 'bour-ing' or tilling, what

we call domesticated plants and animals, or those of the household.

The Bible is striking in the way it outlines things. The Hebrew too, knew of human type species that we today call "hunters and gatherers." The Hebrew saying for the modern term 'hunters and gatherers' is "created ones of the earth," or to use the KJV translation, "Beasts of the earth." In Middle English the word 'beast' had many meanings. Today we take 'beast' to mean some animal that is wild or untrained. In earlier times the meaning is not unlike this but a bit broader, in in the same way Evolutionists broaden the meaning of 'animal' to include us folks, namely: 'the human animal.' Likewise 'Beast' is given to uncouth folks, or on a corporate level, uncultured humans from the outlook of those of the Hebrew culture. In the same way Greeks and Romans called all non-Greeks and non-Latin-speakers 'Barbarians,' and Judeans called all others 'unclean.'

Indeed, if we look at the Book of Jonah (dealing with the years around 750BC, so several thousand years after Adam-plural) the term 'beast' is still in Hebrew use for a type of man. In Jonah 3:8 we read that beasts put on clothing, understand the king's order to do so, cried as men unto the Lord, were able to repent and had hands. (a similar episode is recorded at Mount Sinai - Ex 19:13). Nineveh was a melting-pot filled with Adamites and 'beasts of the earth.'

In closing, the Genesis account therefore teaches us

**Our Lord is emphatic:** "Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt 7:21). Can anyone deny the Law of God, i.e. the major part of the Bible, and still do the will of the Father? Whose will do they then do? Such people speak of being led by the Spirit, but in practice their lives manifest the barest compliance with a few laws, i.e. no adultery (usually), no murder, and no obvious theft with respect to men. (They steal from God daily, Malachi 3:8-9). Their goal seems to be minimal religion, fire insurance, not the service of the Lord. Can it be theft before the cross to withhold TITHES and offerings from the Lord, and a virtue the day after? Are we on a lower moral plane than our ancestors of old Israel? Paul's great argument in Romans is not to make void the law but to establish it! (Rom 3:31).



that God first made 'hunters and gatherers,' [the Negroid, Mongoloid, cro-magnum and so forth - Gen 1:24 - who were not made to be 'tilled' or cultivated (by whites); then he made Adamic-Man as a race but they had no one to teach them 'the way' until God made Adam the Son of Adam (plural-the Race). We use that way of speech today namely 'Son of man' when we say of some great person, "He was Australia's (or America's) greatest son," thus put into a Biblical structure an 'America's greatest son' would read, 'Son of America.' So, "Son of Man" means "the greatest son to come forth from the White Race of Adam."

[If at a later date, you get a copy of Lawrence Blanchard's book relating to 'did all the races come from Adam?', you may want to refer back to this article!]

## NEIGHBOUR & BROTHER

a word study by Paul de Witt

Neighbour, according to Strong's 7453 - *REYA*:- "An associate (more or less close) brother, companion, fellow, friend, neighbour." Derived from 7462 - *RAAH*:- "To tend flock, ie pasture it." Also used to obtain the word 'neighbour' is 7934 - *SHAKEN*:- "a resident" by extension. Typically, Strong's has translated the word in its popular usage rather than in its literal meaning. Even today, our folk use this word in this context rather than in its true meaning. A neighbour is someone who is of your tribe or race. Not anyone of any racial stock that happens to live nearby. The word is derived, according to Webster's 1828 Dictionary, from the Saxon '*nehgebur*':- a 'nigh boor' - meaning literally "a boor (countryman) living nigh (nearby)."

Nigh has several meanings which enhance the racial nature of the word when used with the word Boor. 1) "Near, not distant or remote in place or time." 2) "Closely allied by blood as a nigh kinsman." 5) "close in fellowship; intimate in relation," eg given is "*Ye are made nigh by the blood of Christ*" Eph 2:13. I wish to point out that the relationship that Christ has with Israel is as a KINSMAN-REDEEMER.


Boor is derived from the saxon 'gebur':- a countryman or farmer" or in Dutch:- 'boer' meaning:- "a rustic or farmer" or in German:- 'bauer' meaning "a countryman and a builder." Thus a 'neighbour' is a kinsman and is likened to a 'brother' and indicates one willing to care for one's needs such as a kinsman would do. Thus doing the 'neighbourly' deed is to treat such a kinsman as the Lord would indicate. This further proves who should be one's neighbour in the real meaning of the word. King Jesus said: "*You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind. This is the great and foremost commandment. The second is like it, you shall love EVERY-ONE as yourself. On these two commandments depend the whole Law and the Prophets.*" [Matt 22:37-40] Is anyone frowning about this verse yet? Surely this is what it is taught to mean by all the churches? But this is NOT what it says, is it? Obviously then, there must be a big difference between neighbour and everyone!! By following "*you shall love your neighbour as yourself*" one honours the heavenly Father. Just like you would tell to your children 'love your siblings,' and then the next generation 'love your cousins,' and so forth, and then 'neighbour' becomes the bottom line.

So I guess one should love his neighbour as he loves himself. How does one love himself? Like a brother of course. 'Brethren' or 'brothers' are words that are often used symbolically of those who obey God's Word and Laws. However not all brothers obey God's Laws. "*I wrote you in my letter not to associate with immoral people; I did not at all mean with the immoral people of this world (kosmos), or with the covetous and swindlers, or with idolaters; for then you would have to go out of the world. But actually, I wrote to you not to associate with any so-called brother if he should be an immoral person*" [pornos: fornicator, whore-

monger], *or covetous* [pleonektes: holding, or desiring more - eager for gain, avaricious, defrauder], *or an idolater* [eidolater: image worshipper, literally or figuratively], *or a reviler* [loidoros: abusive, a blackguard], *or a drunkard* [methusos: tipsy, a sot], *or a swindler* [harpax: rapacious, extortion] - *not even to eat with such a one.*" (1 Cor 5:9-11).

Strong's translates 'brother' from Hebrew 251 ACH:- "a brother (used in the widest sense of literal relationship and metaphorically, affinity or resemblance) another, brother, kindred, like, other." And from the Greek 80 ADELPHOS:- "a brother (literally or figuratively) near or remote." Thus a 'brother' is not just one who is born of the same parents nor is he just one who has fellowship with you. He can ALSO be a lawbreaker, thus an Israelite; as only Israel was given God's commandments, statutes, ordinances and judgments. All of creation was given God's gravity laws and other physicals, but that does NOT mean we are to preach to ALL OF CREATION, the laws, commandments, statutes and ordinances that were given to Israel, as did St Francis of Assisi, (a loophead who preached the gospel to birds, etc.).

Webster's says of 'Brother,' "In Scripture, the term brother is applied to a kinsman by blood more remote than a son of the same parents; as in the case of Abraham and Lot, Jacob and Laban." So we can see that the Biblical usage of the word brother applied not just to those of a congregation but also to one who is of the same genetic stock, regardless of whether or not he was lawless. Though Christ himself referred to those Israelites and Saxons who obeyed God, as his brothers. (see Matt 12:49-50 & Mark 3:33-35) he was still a kinsman redeemer for all of Israel. From now on and evermore, (Anglo-Saxon-Celtic) Israelites should be careful about how they use the word neighbour and also about who they have as neighbours. They should not only be Israelites, but they should NOT be lawless Israelites. A difficult task, given the modern environment. More reason for an Ecclesia to be established. [Come out from among them and] BE YE SEPARATE!!!!



4.3 You say there is no burning hell, and yet I read in Revelation 20:15 about sinners being cast into the lake of fire. How do you explain that?

First of all, this verse says nothing about men being tortured in that "fire." It does not even tell us that those sinners will be immortal and will remain alive while that "fire" tortures them for eternity. If the fire were literal, then the most we could say is that the sinners would be burned up and destroyed.

The problem usually arises when we fail to read Daniel 7 along with Revelation 20. Daniel 7:9,10 speaks of the great judgment: "... His throne was like the fiery flame; and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him; the judgment was set, and the books were opened."

Daniel pictures the "lake of fire" as issuing from God and His throne. The throne is a universal symbol of Law. A king sitting upon a throne pictures that king ruling by Law and judging the people by means of Law. Thus, the



fiery throne of Daniel 7:9 is actually the fiery Law of God by which God judges all men. Deut 33:2 speaks of God's Law as a "fiery Law," and Jeremiah 23:9 says, "Is not my word like a fire?"

So it all boiled down to one thing: If you want to learn the nature of the "lake of fire," you must learn the basic principles of God's Law by which God judges all sin. Does God's Law demand torture for sin? No, for Paul tells us that "the wages of sin is death." (Note: it does NOT say "spiritual death"). It is a basic principle of Bible Law that justice is never satisfied until full restitution has been paid to all the victims of injustice. Our modern minds have been conditioned by tradition to believe that justice is when the criminal has been properly tortured on the rack or behind bars, but these penalties for sin are not found in God's Law.

Rather, God's Law demands restitution, because the purpose and goal of God's judgments are: (1) to repay all victims of injustice; and (2) to correct and rehabilitate the sinner. God's judgments are much like a parent disciplining a child in this way. God's fiery judgment is corrective in nature, as Isaiah 26:9 says: "*When Thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness.*"

The lake of fire is described in Rev. 21:8 as "*the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.*" The Greek word translated "brimstone" actually means *sulfur*, but the word has a double meaning. The original Greek word is *theo*, usually translated "God." Sulphur, or theo, was considered to be sacred to the ancient Greeks. It was used to purify and cleanse. Thus, in its verb form the word means to hallow, make divine, or to dedicate to God.

Thus, the lake of fire and brimstone is a lake of divine purification or consecration to God. Its purpose will be to correct and purify the sinner, not simply to torture him or even annihilate him. Those who are cast into this lake of fire will be forced to pay restitution for all the sins they committed, since they did not place their faith in the righteousness of Christ and receive forgiveness of sins. We may not know how God is going to judge each sin, but God has given us His righteous and just Law that we may know the basic principles of true justice. Let us not be swayed by the "justice" of the world, with its imprisonment and torture.

You will never have true justice where someone (even the State) profits from the "sin," only a perpetuation of corruption. America's Promise, Box 157 Sandpoint ID 83864

### SCHOOLS WAGE QUIET WAR UNDERMINING FAMILY VALUES

by Thomas Sowell

No one seems to have a harder time figuring out who the "cultural elite" are than the cultural elite themselves. No one seems to have a harder time figuring out what the "values" issue is about than those who have been working overtime to undermine the values traditional in our society. All across this country, the under-mining and destruction of the values that children were taught at home is going on in public schools from the kindergarten on up. Only from time to time, as particular books, movies, or lessons come to light and outrage the public, does this cultural warfare surface. The flurry of the moment passes. But the undermining of this country's values continues - pervasively, relentlessly, and quietly.

One of the first things a family tries to teach its children is the difference between right and wrong. One of the first things our schools try to destroy is that distinction. This destruction is called "values clarification" - except in places where parents and the public have caught on to what this lying and lofty phrase really means. The more up-to-date way to carry on the destruction of traditional values is to claim to be solving some social problem like drugs, AIDS, or teen-age pregnancy. Only those

few people who have the time to research the specifics as to what is actually being done in "drug education," "sex education," or "death education" courses know what an utter fraud these labels are. These are not courses about drugs, AIDS, teen-age pregnancy, etc. They are courses about how right and wrong are outmoded notions, about how your parents' ideas are no guide for you, and about how each person must start from scratch to develop his or her own way of behaving. Schools are only one of the battlegrounds. Children going to and from school must pass racks of dirty newspapers on display, on streets all across the country. They dare not enter many of the urban parks, where every form of degeneracy flourishes. All this happens, not because the Constitution requires that we permit it, not because the people have voted to permit it, but because judges responsive to the media's values and preferences chose to lie about the Constitution and say that it requires that we suffer what untold generations before us refused to suffer, though living under the very same constitution.

CONGRATULATIONS!  
To Marco and Rebecca  
Rusterholz, on the birth of  
their second child, a son  
named Saxon. Thanks be to  
the heavenly Father who  
allowed both to go home the  
same day! Blessings on you.

That the Supreme Court would play to this gallery while using these elite "evolving standards" instead of the Constitution they were sworn to uphold is one sign of where we are in the culture wars. Hollywood, television news and entertainment alike, and much of the elite print media likewise reflect a set of values antithetical to the values which have shaped this nation and which still hold sway amongst most of us. People who played Russian roulette in their sex lives or drug usage, and who caught AIDS as a result, are repeatedly depicted by the media elite as "victims," not only of the disease but also of "society," not only as tragic sufferers but as somehow heroes, in a way in which people who suffer from cancer or Alzheimer's are not. The point here is that this viewpoint is radically different from the viewpoint of most people - and yet it has a virtual monopoly in the media. Views reflecting what ordinary people think are not merely left unrepresented, but are stigmatized and denounced by those who insist that we be "non-judgmental" toward others. This daily drumbeat of AIDS stories with this single viewpoint vastly exceeds any coverage given to diseases that claim many times more lives. And yet anyone who even calls attention to this and other propaganda and manipulation is met with: "What culture wars? What cultural elite?" It is hard to get through a single news broadcast, whether network, local, or on "public" TV, without a story clearly designed to indoctrinate us -- or, as the anointed would put it, "raise our consciousness" about some issue. It is absolutely impossible to get through a single nature program without being propagandized with the Sierra Club's political slant. Nowhere is one-sided indoctrination with elite values antithetical to traditional values more pervasive than on elite college campuses. The college curriculum is increasingly invaded by courses which do not try to teach students how to think, but what conclusions to reach - on issues ranging from race and gender to environmentalism and Marxism. Freshman orientation used to be about getting acquainted with academic requirements and college living arrangements. Today, it is about learning what attitudes are "politically correct." To reinforce the ideological message, there are cultural commissars in the dormitories to tell students what to think, and what they dare not say. These commissars are called "resident advisors" and the party line is called "residential education." At Cornell University, applicants for jobs as resident advisors were shown movies of men having sex with each other, presumably to weed out those unable to accept the avant-garde viewpoint. What culture wars? Give me a break!-----

Received an interesting tape: **DEAD DOCTORS DON'T LIE** by Joel Wallach. If you are interested in maintaining your health, you must listen to this tape. Send a donation of \$5 and we'll send you a copy. (#X-205). Again, another month has gone. Thanks for all your prayers and financial support - both are needed and appreciated! If you have friends (or your adult children) who may be interested in receiving this material, please send us their names and addresses. May the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob bless you and keep you and make His face shine on you for your faithfulness,

