



# 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 an 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!*

#199

Newsletter

October AD2002

## ETHNIC CLEANSING IN RHODESIA

### Mugabe’s wife to move into white couple’s farm

by Peta Thornycroft (filed 20/08/02)

Zimbabwe’s first lady, Grace Mugabe has chosen the white-owned farm she wants and has ordered its elderly owners and residents off the land, it emerged yesterday.

Mrs. Mugabe has picked the Iron Mask Estate, 30 miles north west of Harare, which belongs to John and Eva Matthews, both in their seventies. The couple abandoned their home at the weekend.

According to residents on the farm, Mrs. Mugabe and a high-powered entourage visited the property last week, she said she would be moving in shortly and told them to find alternative accommodation. (it used to be just called “*stealing*”). The news came as police continued their hunt for white farmers refusing to move off their land after the passing of a deadline set by President Robert Mugabe’s regime.

Mr. Mugabe’s supporters have moved on to several farms in the eastern part of the country while the owners were in police cells. Farm equipment and personal possessions were looted, although police denied any knowledge of the crimes. More than 20 white farmers were charged yesterday for defying the government order. The administration has ordered 2,900 of the remaining 4,500 white commercial farmers to leave their land without compensation, although 2,000 have refused. More than 200 have been arrested.

In Chegutu, 60 miles south of Harare, eight farmers, including the president of the Commercial Farmers’ Union, were formally charged and released on bail. Jean Baldwin, 72, was given one month to leave her property after pleading that her husband was terminally ill and the family needed time to arrange their departure. “We have nowhere to go,” she said later.

In another case, in rural Nyamandhlovu, 40 miles north of Zimbabwe’s second city, Bulawayo, 13 cheerful farmers, several of them pensioners, were granted bail, but were waiting at the local farmers’ club late into the afternoon to hear whether they could return home before the next court hearing next month. Before their court hearing, the barefoot farmers, several exercising in a small enclosure outside their cells, cracked jokes.

David Olds, whose mother and older brother were murdered by Mr. Mugabe’s militia on their farms, stripped off his shirt and turned his face and chest to the early morning sun to warm up after a cold night on concrete. Police in Nyamandhlovu refused to let the press or the wives of the accused attend the hearing in the local magistrates court within the police compound. The wives were told that the police were anxious about possible hostilities from people

gathered across the road.

The nationwide swoop on the white farmers, including a woman breast-feeding a one-month-old baby, has irreparably damaged Zimbabwe’s commercial agriculture at a time when half the population is on the brink of starvation. (as long as it’s the black half, let them starve!)[and stop sending them aid!!!]

Several hundred farmers, particularly in the provinces where Mr. Mugabe’s ruling ZANU-PF is strong, have fled their homes and businesses, most of them for ever. A lawyer representing farmers at the Myanathi magistrate’s court, also in Matabeleland, said his eight clients were granted bail and allowed to return home for a month to wind up their affairs. This, the lawyer said on condition of anonymity, would allow them time to challenge the constitutionality of their evictions. (I’m sure Mr. Mugabe would act according to the constitution, aren’t you? Just like our pollies always do, too! - Yeah)

But in Bindura, 45 miles north of Harare, lawyers said their clients’ bail conditions amounted to a conviction as, although they were released, they were given less than 24 hours to return home for the last time, pack up and go. (where?)

The country’s most prominent farmer, Colin Cloete, president of the CFU, handed himself over to police and was charged and ordered to leave his farm immediately as part of his bail conditions. \*\*

- 9 Aug 2002: Farmers fearful of eviction deadline.
- 17 Aug 2002: Blacks take over farms as whites flee police.
- 18 Aug 2002: Mugabe’s men storm farms as arrests

### IN THIS ISSUE:

Ethnic Cleansing in Rhodesia, .....	1
Faith and Works, Rushdoony, .....	2
Our Own House Out of Order, Rod Martin, .....	3
Response to Mr Rod Martin, L. Blanchard, .....	5
How to Pick a “Good” Government School, .....	7
The Gospel According to Proverbs, .....	8
Its About Time, The Sabbaths, Pt 6, De Witt, ...	10
The Trouble With Flag Wavers, .....	14
Clearance of cheap pamphlets, .....	12

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!

begin.

•19 Aug 2002: Mugabe gangs arrest 147 white farmers.

© Copyright of Telegraph Group Limited 2002.

Courtesy Christian Research, Box 385 Eureka Springs AR 72632

Do not support any "aid" organization which gives aid to blacks, or which gives *the children's bread to the dogs!*

## FAITH AND WORKS

by **R. J. Rushdoony**

James 2:14-26

*"What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him? If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food (e.g. our white brothers and sisters in Rhodesia, CIM) And one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone. Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works. Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble. But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead? Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God and it was imputed upon him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God. Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only. Likewise also was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way? For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also.*

### Theology vs. Life

This may well be the most controversial text in all the Bible. Many avoid James' epistle because they will not face up to this text.

We need to recognize that much can be separated in analysis that cannot be separated in life. We can and of necessity do analyze the human respiratory system and the circulatory system separately, but neither can exist without the other. Faith in theology is tied to the doctrine of salvation, and works to sanctification, but, just as breathing is necessary for the life of the heart, so too are works to a living faith.

This is why James can say, "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only" (v.24). Those who would separate faith and works can only do so theologically, and they should do so, but in life the two are inseparable. To take a theological distinction and assume that in life what is an otherwise valid and necessary difference is a radical separation of one from the other is to confuse dissection with life.

James confronts us with this fact: "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works, can faith save him?" (v 14) Can a man live with a heart only, and not lungs?

James then uses a very practical illustration of the interconnection of faith and works. Given the need for charity in the Jerusalem Christian *synagogue* (meeting - the place or the gathering, another of those 'transliterated' words), and like

churches elsewhere, his example is both blunt and real. If a fellow believer is naked and hungry, and if we simply say, "Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled," or, "we will pray for you," and nothing more, what good is all this? Such a professed faith, having no works, is dead. It is dead because faith cannot stand alone: it manifests itself in works (vv 15-17).

James is *not* anti-theology; what he is against is the separation of theology from life, the reduction of faith to easy-believism, and the negation of action as the expression of faith. Neither valid faith nor valid works can be separated one from another. How can any man demonstrate a valid faith without works? Faith is shown by works (v 18).

### Easy Believism

Simply belief saves no man. "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble" (v 19). A more blunt and telling statement of the case cannot be imagined. The devils believe that God is; the knowledge makes them tremble, *but it does not save them.*

"But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" (v 20) Such a man is called *vain* by James. The word is *kenos*, meaning empty, foolish, senseless, purposeless; it is highly uncomplimentary. James does not dignify the position as one of valid dissent: it is a fool's opinion.

Then, in vv 21-24, James turns to Abraham, the covenant father, revered by Christians. He says without qualifications that Abraham was "justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar" (v 21). The reality of Abraham's faith was manifested in his readiness to obey God, even to binding Isaac to the altar (Gen 22:9). God waited until Abraham's faith was

shown by his works before He delivered Isaac.

James continues, "Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works by faith made perfect" (v 22). Literally, James says, "faith worked with his works." Faith became works, a realization of itself. Faith expressed itself, or revealed itself, in works. There is an essential connection between the two. This, James says, is what the Scripture means when it says, "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness: and he was called the Friend of God" (v 23).

It is in 2 Chronicles 20:7 that Abraham is called God's "friend for ever." In Genesis 15:6, we are told that Abraham "believed in the LORD; and he counted it to him for righteousness." Paul cites this verse in Romans 4:3 and Galatians 3:6. Paul uses the text to criticize the idea of salvation through works, James to call attention to the emptiness of faith without works. It was Paul who, in Romans 3:31 said, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: we establish the law." Above all, our Lord in Matthew 7:16-23 makes totally clear that "Ye shall know them by their fruits," i.e. by their works.

It is plain, James insists, that a man is justified by his works, not by faith only (v 24). Works manifest the reality of a man's faith, so that his justification is shown to be real by his works, not by his faith only.



James then gives another illustration, Rahab. The account in Joshua make obvious the terror of the people of Jericho. They knew what God had done to other peoples, so they believed that the Hebrews' God was working to destroy Israel's enemies. Only Rahab *acted* on that faith; her works alone showed the reality of her faith. Hence, James says, she was justified by her works, i.e. her justification was manifested in her works.

Very clear in all that James has to say is that both faith and works have reference to God and to His Law. The Council of Trent related faith to assent to the church, and too many Protestant groups have in practice tended to do the same. Both faith and works must be seen as essentially a trust in and obedience to God and His inscriptured Word.

James concludes with another blunt statement: "*For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also*" (v 26). James does not say it is weak, but rather that it is dead. Here again, as in the Sermon on the Mount, and all the gospels and epistles, we are told how to "judge righteous judgment" (Jn 7:24). There are many who follow ancient Greek thinking to say that we cannot know a man's heart and therefore cannot judge him, whereas our Lord says plainly, "*by their fruits ye shall know them*" (Matt 7:20). Works are faith in action, faith made manifest.

Courtesy Chalcedon Report, Box 158 Vallecito CA 95251

-----  
 -----Note by Lawrence Blanchard: The following is a reprint of an article by attorney Rod D. Martin that appeared recently in a well known publication that reaches those of the reformed theological persuasion. It is followed by a response from Pastor Lawrence Blanchard sent to Mr. Martin. The purpose of this reprint and response in this publication is to help equip the readers with some pointers on how to make a defense of the gospel and to be ready to give an answer to anyone who asks about our faith.  
 -----

**"OUR OWN HOUSE OUT OF ORDER: RACIAL OPPRESSION AND ITS DEFENDERS"**

by Rod D. Martin, Chalcedon Report, June/July 2002

Let us start at the start: I am a Southerner, and an Arkansan. I am proud of my heritage. I am glad we celebrate Robert E. Lee's birthday. As an attorney and a student of history, it is my professional opinion not only that states may secede, but that the Constitution would never have ratified had it been suggested they might not. I prefer my own region of the country to any other on Earth, I honor the patriots in my own family who died for The Lost Cause, and my accent is thick enough to make George Wallace blush.

But I can't stand racism. And neither can our Lord. Instantly some will cry "Political Correctness!" But this is nothing of the sort. Others will assume I'm speaking of the so-called "Christian Identity" crowd and other barely-disguised neo-Klansmen. I am not. They are nothing but terrorists without the guts (or maybe the opportunity) to pull the trigger, so far beyond the pale of orthodox Christianity as not to be worthy of discussion.

No, I'm talking about our own house out of order, the camp of the Reformed. In the name of preserving our heritage - particularly in the South and in South Africa - many today embrace virtually all that has gone before, so long as our forebears did it. We hear defenses of apartheid on the

(exceedingly dubious) ground that it was "meant" to separate men by confession thus actually promoting freedom of association) rather than establish an almost Hindu caste system based explicitly, legally on race. We hear many other arguments as well, not the least of which is that the evils of the African National Congress (ANC) - communism, terrorism, and a thousand other very real horrors - justify the wickedness of those confessional Calvinists whom they supplanted.

Closer to home, an increasingly vocal number of our brethren are not content to praise only the virtues of the antebellum South. Rather than applying the discernment God commands, they join the bandwagon of the reactionaries: If a liberal opposes it, they must support it, with a knee-jerk certainly as predictable as a Washington Post editorial. They wax eloquent about the humane nature of Southern slavery, about the handful of blacks who owned slaves (and the large number of African blacks who sold them) [see *Who Brought The Slaves to America?* Mohr, #472 @ \$2.40], about the equally tiny group who fought for Southern Independence. Some embrace the old pre-war arguments for slavery<sup>1</sup> (and instantly dismiss any Biblical scholarship - especially Gary North's groundbreaking work<sup>2</sup> - contending that the New Covenant has abolished it). They ignore the effect this has on their witness. They ignore the effect this has on the church's evangelism. They ignore the message they pass down to their covenant children.

But we cannot ignore it. Racism is antithetical to the very idea of the gospel, and not merely because it is offensive. It is evil. God despises it. And if there is a lesson to be learned from our forebears, it is that those nations which have practiced it, those Calvinist utopias which supposedly should have seen the blessings of Deuteronomy 28, have in fact seen its curses: They have been wiped from the face of the Sovereign God's Earth.

**WHY IS RACISM EVIL?**

Why is racism evil? However many reasons there may be (and there are many), the core reason is very simple: Racism lies about the gospel.

In his outstanding book *Reforming Marriage*, Douglas Wilson well illustrates this idea in the context of families. Commenting on Ephesians 5, he notes that "husbands, in their role as head, provide a picture of Christ and the church. Every marriage, everywhere in the world, is a picture of Christ and the church. Because of sin and rebellion, many of these pictures are slanderous lies concerning Christ. *But a husband can never stop talking about Christ and the church*" [emphasis in the original].

Whatever a husband does that is inconsistent with the character of Christ is necessarily a lie, implicitly or explicitly, about the Lord. Thus, when husbands act sinfully, they deceive their wives and families about the Lord, with far-reaching results no man can know. This certainly violates the Ninth Commandment (and it may violate some or all of the others as well); but this is not fundamentally a Ninth Commandment issue. For a Christian husband, this is primarily about taking the Lord's Name in vain.

Just so, this is exactly what the South and South

**Tapes of The Month**  
**AC-2123 ONE BLOOD** - Charles Weisman  
 A thorough, well-presented refutation of the new Judeo-Christian book entitled: '*One Blood*', which promotes interracial marriage and universalism. As always, Charles does an excellent job on this message and shows the research he has done, to reach these conclusions. Must listening for all!! \$5

**Coming Soon!**

a booklet dealing with the seventh commandment, showing that it is not a repetition of the 10th, but in fact should read: Thou shalt not *adulterate* - that is pollute through mixing. (i.e. no inter-racial marriage!)



Africa (and Puritan Massachusetts) did with regard to race.

These ostensibly Calvinist, Christian commonwealths, through their racial policies and attitudes, did far more than separate the races. The blacks (and others) they were dealing with only came into contact with the gospel by means of the whites they met, and those whites by and large were racists.

The gospel, though, is anything *but* racist; it denies *any* racial distinction, putting the Gentile and the Jew on the same footing, abolishing any thought of a salvation based on blood, and establishing a covenant centered on a spiritual rebirth made possible by grace alone, through faith alone, in the sacrificial work of Christ alone. Rich, poor, black, white, Jew, Gentile, covenant child or converted pagan, there is no difference; and we come to the Lord in that hope.

Racism practised by a Christian denies all of this, no matter what weasel words proceed from their lips. The "Christian" racist is speaking with a forked tongue: He claims that the faithful Gentile is the true son of Abraham; but in reality, he is the Pharisee refusing to sit with the publican, the Judaizer seeking to circumcise the Gentile convert. Worse still, he says that the convert may *not* be circumcised, because one clearly cannot change his race.

But in the kingdom, there is no race, or nation, or any division of flesh. Christ has united all His people in the spirit. And those who say otherwise, whether explicitly or implicitly, like the wayward husband, take His name in vain.

Question 113 of the Westminster Larger Catechism explains the connection between these concepts:

*Q: What are the sins forbidden in the third commandment?*

*A: The sins forbidden in the third commandment are, the not using of God's name as is required; ... misinterpreting, misapplying, or any way perverting the Word, or any part of it, to ... the maintaining of false doctrines; ... anywise opposing of God's truth, grace, and ways; ... being... a shame to it, by uncomfortable, unwise, unfruitful, and offensive walking ...*

Clearly, "taking the Lord's Name in vain" is a great deal more than "cussing." It is (among other things) any perversion of the Word, and particularly any misrepresentation of God's truth. Needless to say, the more serious that truth, the more serious the offense; and nothing is more serious than the nature of the gospel itself.

That seriousness becomes all too clear in WCF Question 114, which predicts for us God's response:

*Q: What reasons are annexed to the third commandment?*

*A: [B]ecause he is the Lord and our God, therefore his name is not to be profaned, or any way abused by us; especially because he will be so far from acquitting and sparing the transgressors of this commandment, as that he will not suffer them to escape his righteous judgment, albeit many such escape the censures and punishments of men.*

It is for this reason that God especially hated the sin of His people in the South and in South Africa. They were building entire civilizations based on a lie about Him, about His Son, and about His sacrifice and saving grace; moreover, they were doing it quite explicitly in His Name. God destroyed each of these civilizations from the Earth; no one who affirms sovereignty may void that. Yet ever greater numbers seek to avoid the common sinful, thread.

## WHEN WILL WE EVER LEARN?

God hates the lies we tell about his transcendent work when we practice racism, particularly in His Name. It's long past time we learn the lesson: He will not abide it in His people.

Never mind that the largely-Christian South was Constitutionally correct in every particular, and that the Southern states had every legal right to secede. Despite all of this, it is virtually inescapable to conclude that the South came under God's judgment. Given that, if this is so, God's judgment involved its utter and total destruction, politically, economically, and culturally. God's opposition to the South's sins must have been pretty extreme.<sup>3</sup>

Likewise, though those exact same states were right in the 1950s and 1960s about their Constitutional rights *vis-à-vis* the federal government (bloated with power and constitutionally unrecognizable), Jim Crow was nevertheless evil. And just as God destroyed the South a hundred years before at the hands of a Northern oppressor, and just as God destroyed the southern kingdom of Judah two and a half millennia before at the hands of a Babylonian oppressor, so God eviscerated (disemboweled) the South's (and everyone else's) Constitutional rights in consequence of the South's abuse of that freedom.

Likewise, white, largely-Calvinist South Africa - whose systematic oppression [the blacks were much better off under Apartheid than they are today! CIM] of its non-whites was much greater than the South's in the 1950s, but much less than the South's in the 1850s - seems clearly to have received a dose of the same medicine that God's been dishing out to His wayward people for several thousand years now (but, mercifully for us, too late for its new pro-Soviet rulers to hand it over to the Evil Empire).

If we believe in predictable, historical sanctions for nations, if we affirm Deuteronomy 28, we simply cannot ignore these things. Until Christian - and particularly Calvinists - get over their adulterous love affair with racism, they might as well forget taking dominion. God will keep frustrating their efforts, splitting their denominations, and destroying their political entities until they get their own house in order.

This is, by the way, far from their only sin. But it's pretty clear from the past 140 years of history that it's pretty high on God's list. -----

Notes:<sup>1</sup> It is not within the scope of this article to debate the Biblical legality of slavery. Though I do contend that slavery has been abolished, the South's race-slavery was a rather unique - indeed, "peculiar" - institution, and my argument pertains here to the racial aspect of it, as also to other manifestations of racism such as the African slave trade, Jim Crow laws, apartheid, and Klan activity; and (from the other direction) "reverse discrimination" as well, whether the relatively mild quota programs in the United States or the authoritarian tuggery of Robert Mugabe's Zimbabwe. That all said, I also maintain (with Scripture) that even were slavery lawful, it would not necessarily be profitable. Never mind the economic foolishness of it; the effect of slavery on its participants - both slaves and masters - is so generally wretched that a progressively-sanctified church should abhor it, just as it hates polygamy (which, like slavery, is not explicitly abolished) and divorce.

2. In his utterly unique economic commentaries on the Pentateuch, North both describes the operation of the Bible's slave laws

### New Book

#### WHAT FOLLOWS THE GOSPEL?

This booklet by Arnold Kennedy was "translated" into New Anglo-ish by Adam de Witt. This is really for those who are into understanding this New Anglo-ish. A conventional English version will be available shortly. If ordering specify: New or Conventional, Please! #620 @ \$3.50

*When people first become Christians, it is not long before many ask whether or not any part of the Old Testament Law of God has any room in their new life. This book addresses that.*



in a detail and with a mastery few (if any) have ever approached, and also demonstrates conclusively that Christ has abolished slavery in the new Covenant era. See primarily Gary North, *Tools of Dominion: The Case Laws of Exodus* (Tyler, TX: Institute for Christian Economics, 1990), ch 4 for a discussion of the Biblical theology of slavery; and ch 5, pp228-247, for an understanding of Biblical (as opposed to 19th century Unitarian) abolition. For further information see North, *Leviticus: An Economic Commentary on I Timothy*, specifically that section of Appendix C concerning "The Slave Family in the Ante-Bellum South," commenting on which the author raises the very good question: "Offer me biblical reasons why God would bother to preserve any Christian society that has this view of the family."

3. In a recent article concerning the (im)propriety of pronouncing God's judgment in current events (and particularly with regard to the events of September 11, 2002), I wrote that "[M]en who don't want to look foolish don't call the game in the first quarter." I am by no means retracting this position, quite the contrary. What I am saying is that after the passage of a great deal of time, an event so large as the utter destruction of a nation not only may but must be examined in the light of Scripture. Indeed, if Biblical conclusions may not be drawn this long after Appomattox, with regard to the utter annihilation of the mostly-Christian Southern civilization - a nation which was legally in the right on virtually every major point except this one - the idea of "predictable covenantal sanctions" is meaningless."

[Rod D. Martin is founder and chairman of Vanguard PAC (www.theVanguard.org). A former policy director to Arkansas Governor Mike Huckabee and Sturgis Fellow at Cambridge University; he is a Fellow of the Kuyper Institute for Political Studies, a writer and attorney from Little Rock, Arkansas, and a one-and-future candidate for U.S. House of Representatives. He can be contacted at Rod.Martin@theVanguard.org]. .... and now ....

## "RESPONSE TO MR. MARTIN"

by *Pastor Lawrence Blanchard*

Dear Mr. Martin,

An acquaintance of mine forwarded to me your article "Our Own House Out Of Order," which appeared recently in the June/July 2002 issue of the *Chalcedon Report*. I read and re-read your article with interest and was compelled to offer you a response.

Let me introduce myself first. I presently serve as associate pastor of a small church in northern Kentucky. I am a graduate of Denver (Conservative Baptist) Seminary (M.Div. 1979), have spent six years in the Philippines as a missionary, and about fourteen years in the pastoral ministry here in the States. I have authored four books (self-published) of which three are theological works supporting the premises of the Christian-Israel Covenant message (sometimes referred to as Christian Identity) and otherwise challenging the Judeo-Christian perspective of the Bible.

I say all this because I want you to know I have been on both sides of these theological spectrums. Therefore, I am well acquainted with the arguments both sides advocate to support their positions.

I am compelled to write to you in response to your article because I am seeing more and more Judeo-Christians coming out to attack the concept of "racism" and launch attacks on those who hold to a different point of view

regarding the meaning of the gospel of the kingdom. I offer the following challenge to your belief regarding "racism" and the Scriptures for your consideration.

Before I get into my response to your main argument regarding "racism," I want to address your comment about the "Christian Identity crowd" as you call it. First, you must realize this term "Christian Identity" is a label that has been demonized like the KKK or Nazis. Christian Identity is a rather broad designation like "Baptist." There are a hundred different varieties of Baptists out there, just as there are many differing belief systems within Christian Identity. Frankly, I do not think that Christian Identity is the best and most accurate name for the central belief that God has chosen a racial family from Adam through Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as His treasured possession and promised them an unconditional covenant (the Abrahamic covenant). Therefore, I believe it is a more accurate to identify this theological perspective as the Christian-Israel Covenant message.

### New Book

## IT'S ABOUT TIME: THE SABBATHS

**They will get it right, ... One Day....**

by Adam de Witt.

There have been many long and hard arguments between friends and brethren over which 'day' is the true 'sabbath' (rest) as instituted by God. Adam proves conclusively that both arguments are flawed as they are based on Man's calendar instead of God's calendar. You can never observe the correct day, if you base it on the wrong calendar. Also shows that the day changes at midnight, and not at noon as some say, or at sunset as others say. A thorough and needed study!

**#161 @ \$8.50ppd**

This book is not for everyone - some are too blind to understand logic.

People, like myself, who advocate that God made a special covenant relationship with the descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and recognize through the evidences of history and archeology that these descendants are today's Anglo-Saxon-Celtic-Germanic-Scandinavian and kindred peoples, are often labelled with derogatory names such as "racists," "bigots" and the one you applied, "terrorists." Do you personally know people who hold to the belief of the Christian-Israel-Covenant message? I know hundreds of people who believe this message. The majority of them are fine, upstanding, and sincere folks with a few unusual and bizarre ones thrown into the mix. But, they are far from terrorists, Mr Martin.

Additionally, you say that this theological belief system is "not worthy of discussion" because it is "so far beyond the pale of orthodox Christianity." I would disagree, of course. The Christian Israel Covenant theology maintains many central points of orthodoxy such as the inspiration and inerrancy of the Scripture, the sacrificial atonement of Jesus Anointed, etc. There are those few people in the so-called Christian Identity camp who are exceptions. But, on the whole, there are many points of commonality.

On the other hand, our theological perspective would advocate conformity with the words of the Bible itself and with historic Christianity. We ask, for example, "What does the Bible say and what does it mean?" In attempting to answer that question from the whole context of Scripture and by virtue of the evidence of historic Christianity, we believe we can successfully challenge what we think are misconceptions of present-day "orthodox Christianity." Perhaps the following will sufficiently challenge you to find our theological point of view "worthy of discussion."

I notice that you are an attorney and have a broad background in politics, holding different positions of persuasion according to your resume. Having legal training, I know that you demand the precise meaning of words in your work. You use the word "racism" often as this is a central part of your article. However, you never define racism. You identify it with the "Christian Identity



crowd,” slavery in the South, “apartheid” in South Africa, and “evil.” Further, you declare that racism is antithetical to “the gospel” and “inconsistent with the character of Christ. [an adjective being used as a proper noun!]” But, Mr Martin, you never precisely define racism except perhaps by implication that it is an attitude and practice that maintains racial distinctions. And from your applications of racism, it only applies to White people, who have, in the past or present, maintained racial distinctions.

From my research, the words “racist” or “racism” were first invented in the early 1930s and have no etymological root of English derivation. I have also discovered that, depending on which dictionary in the past 30 years one reads, the definition of “racist” or “racism” differs widely in meaning.

My conclusion is, rather than words with precise meaning, “racist” and “racism” are concocted terms to create certain negative impressions especially aimed at White people who have been labelled as the great oppressors of all races. These evil impressions are advanced through sources such as the government, news media, advertising, Hollywood, and public schools among others with mantras that include such words as “tolerance,” “diversity,” “integration,” and of course, the ever popular buzzword - “hate.”

Mr Martin, it is possible that you, like many others, have been unknowingly persuaded by the daily impressions advocated by the opinion managers of our time? Without at least critical analysis of the meaning of the word “racism” and the reason for the constant war against this “evil” by the secular, anti-Christ powers that be, an objective conclusion cannot be made. Hence, the possibility of error in belief and judgment is enhanced.

There are three basic premises that you use to support your conclusion that racism (or racial distinction and separation) is an ungodly evil that must be abolished. First, you claim that the White people who practiced this so-called “racism” reaped the curse of God for their “evil.” In your offer of evidence, you discuss, and then dismiss, the realities of the “antebellum South” where there was (for the most part) “humane” treatment of the Negro slave. Additionally, the South during that time was one of the highlights of American history. However, the consensus by Congress was that slavery had to be abolished and the negroes sent back to Africa. But the point is, the antebellum South was blessed and not cursed by God during the time of slavery. The South, at that time, represented one of the notable periods of Western Christian civilization.

You likewise discuss and dismiss apartheid in South Africa when the Negro worked for the White man and lived under his dominion and laws. As a result, South Africa was one of the most prosperous and crime free nations of the world and the Negroes of South Africa were the most prosperous and well educated in the world. Now, since the ANC has taken over, South Africa is economically destitute and has one of the highest crime rates per capita in the world. You mention these problems but then dismiss them and call the separatist Calvinists of South Africa wicked. I have to shake my head and wonder why you cannot see the disparity of your reasoning upon which you base your conclusion. Were not the blessings of Deuteronomy 28 evident during these times of racial separation?

Mr Martin, where do you live? In a predominately White

neighborhood? Where do you go to church? In a predominately White church? If the answers to the above questions are “yes,” perhaps you could lead the way for all of us and move to a racially mixed neighborhood and attend a mixed church. Would you approve of and bless the marriage of your son or daughter to a Negro or Asian?

I live in northern Kentucky and in one of the largest counties where it is over 96% White. The reason this is so is because, in the last 30 years, a good portion of the Whites in the once predominately White city of Cincinnati moved out when the non-White population increased. Another of the many examples of “White flight” that is happening all across America. But you would call this “racism” would you not? Is it possible, Mr Martin, there is another explanation for the reason White people flee to areas of the country where they can be with their own kind? Are there other reality-based reasons why White people (and other races also) naturally segregate? Or is your reason of “racism” the only possible answer for the racial distinctions practiced by White People?

The second premise to support your conclusion that racism is evil; is that you claim it is “antithetical to .. the gospel.” I believe you also would identify the gospel as the gospel of the Kingdom under the new covenant. So, the gospel or good news preached by Jesus Christ and his apostles was centered on the Kingdom of God. And you say that “in the Kingdom, there is no race, or nation, or any division of flesh.” Was that true when God established His Kingdom in Israel under the Old Covenant? In Exodus

19:6 God told Israel that she would be a Kingdom to Him, provided that they kept the covenant by law. Not only was Israel solely in view here, but also God desired separation from all other people (Exodus 33:16, Leviticus 20:26).

Separation was clearly a part of God’s will. So, there was a distinction and discrimination made by God between peoples and nations and Israel. The question now is, does the distinction that God made with Israel under the Old Covenant apply in the same way under the New Covenant? The answer is “Yes” because the parties of the Old Covenant are the same as those of the New Covenant

“Behold, days are coming, declares the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. - Jeremiah 31:31.

It is widely assumed that the New Covenant was opened up to all races. But that is not what the Bible says. Indeed the Apostle Peter confirms this in the New Covenant Scriptures when he quotes from a selection of references in the Old Covenant which, in context, address Israel alone:

“But you are a **chosen race**, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a **people for God’s own possession**, that you may proclaim the excellencies of Him who has called you out of darkness into His marvelous light.-1 Peter 2:9

Did you think that Peter was referring to “spiritual Israel” here, inclusive of all races? Not according to the next verse where Peter quotes from Hosea 1:10 and 2:23:

“For you once were not a people, but now you are the **people of God**; you had not received mercy, but now you have received mercy.-1 Peter 2:10.

Who were the “people” Hosea was writing about in context of Hosea? The house of Israel, Mr Martin. Under

### Again Available: The Bible Says: DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE IS NOT ADULTERY

by Stephen E. Jones

*Church opinion has long favored the teaching that remarriage after divorce is adultery, based upon what we believe to be a single mistranslated word in Matthew 5:32, and a few incorrect assumptions.*

*The result? A great many people today who are divorced and remarried are being expelled from their churches. Others are refused leadership positions. It is tragic and so very unnecessary. Read and learn truth!*

**#436 @ \$6.25**



the New Covenant, they were still “a chosen race” and “a holy nation.” [holy meaning ‘separated’!]

In order to prove your premise that the gospel is antithetical to racial distinctions, you must evidence that the New Covenant is not a universal covenant inclusive of all races.

This now leads to your third premise that the gospel “denies any racial distinction” because “the Gentile and the Jew [are] on the same footing.” Once again, a common assumption is made by modern-day orthodoxy that all races of people fall into two categories - Gentile and Jew. What you therefore must prove in order to substantiate this premise is that:

1. All Israelites are Jews, and,
2. All Gentiles are non-Israelites.

If you cannot prove these, you have no basis for your conclusion that the Gospel under the New Covenant denies any racial distinction. Further, you must show biblically and scientifically that all races originated from Adam. If you can do this, then you have a solid basis for your racially inclusive belief. If not, you must honestly look at reordering your thinking about race and the Bible.

By the way, I have written a book on this subject matter entitled *Did All Races Come From Adam?* [#584 @ \$27.95] I challenge you to study the evidence presented in this book and weigh the evidence setting aside your prejudicial beliefs.

One more thought before I close. At the end of your article you said that “until Christians - and particularly Calvinists - get over their adulterous love affair with racism, they might as well forget taking dominion.” If by “dominion” you mean that the Christian biblical world view rules in all aspects of our individual lives, families, churches, local, State, and national civil governments, whereby God’s righteousness and justice are administered and all other imposter faiths are excluded, then I must ask, “Since the 1960s, has America become a more Christian nation?” In the early ‘60s civil rights movement, White people were forced at the point of a gun to integrate their schools and subsequently every area and level of society, and since 1965 when the historic racially exclusive immigration laws were liberalized the flood gates were opened up for non-Whites to come into America. In addition, there was an increasing propaganda campaign to brainwash White Americans to render them guilty for thinking or saying anything that would not be politically correct or religiously acceptable “diversity” dictum. And now, this anti-racism plan has reached a fever pitch to the level of “hate crimes” aimed primarily at White people.

But surely, Mr. Martin, you are able to step back and take an objective look at what has happened to America since the 1960s. We are a much more integrated society now than in the 1950s, yet Christianity for all intents and purposes of the Kingdom of God on earth (that is, dominion) is virtually non-existent. We have become a pagan, godless people and nation far from “dominion.” Do you not, therefore, see the correlation between the evolution of our society based on eliminating racial distinctions by forced “public policy” and the parallel destruction of Western Christian civilization?

My sole purpose in writing you, Mr. Martin, is simply to get you to think again and re-examine your presuppositions

upon which you base your conclusion. I trust you will take it as that, and that you may at least change your mind about whether this Christian-Israel Covenant perspective is worthy of discussion after all.

Thank you for reading this. I am certainly open to any further contact you wish to make with me. Until then, may the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob give you wisdom and revelation as you seek His truth.

Yours very truly, Lawrence Blanchard.

Courtesy The New Covenant Messenger, Box 321 Union KY 41091

## HOW TO PICK A “GOOD” GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

by John E. Stoops

“In the state of California, If I had a child there, I wouldn’t put the youngster in a public school ... I think it’s time to get our kids out.” Dr. James Dobson on Focus on the Family Radio, March 2002.

With that comment, Dr. Dobson started quite a stir among thousands of people who are now joining the campaign to “separate school and state.” The government schools have added a lot of fuel to the fire by having Planned Parenthood sponsor skits in class that single out and embarrass Christian students. Disturbing too is the new policy in Hayward, California schools that encourages homosexual teachers to “come out” in the classroom and asks them to invite their partners to join them for the follow-up discussion.

Is there any hope for the government schools? More importantly, how can you decide as a Christian whether they might be a good place to send the child that

God has entrusted to your care? First and foremost, I believe that parents must understand the nature of the battle that has been waged in the government schools during the past one hundred years.

During a recent Dialog on KFIA radio, the discussion revolved around some of these recent troubles in the government schools. It did not take long for a very “concerned” caller to say that if there was any place where he thought the so-called separation of church and state should be maintained, it was certainly in the schools!

Now if this caller meant that the schools were not intended to be churches I would agree, but sadly this is not the case. What the modern intends is to continue the expulsion of all things Christian from our schools: not just the morning prayers or Christmas songs, but all references to God and certainly all traces of the Christian worldview upon which our great nation was founded and most of Western Civilization was built.

Not long ago, these Christian foundations impacted all areas of American life including the government schools, a fact which I remind my listeners about as often as possible. My lovely bride Linda discovered one of the best examples of this influence as she worked to home school our children. While searching for good resource materials, she discovered an 1847 training manual authored by David P. Page used to instruct government school teachers. *Page’s Theory and Practice of Teaching* was for many decades the standard textbook for training government schoolteachers. In the introduction to the 1899 reprint that my wife obtained, E.C. Branson said, “Although more than half a century old, there is hardly a judgment in this

### The Supernatural Satan Doctrine

We have never heard an argument against it. We hear it in the churches, we read it in the magazines, we see it in the movies, we read it in the newspapers and everyone we ever talked to told us that when people die they go to Hell and the devil and his demons stick them with pitchforks forever and ever. We believed this because that was all we ever heard .....

Yet, when we begin to examine the scriptures, this doctrine, oddly enough, just is NOT there. Is the “Satan” and “Lucifer” of the churches really a hoax? Read:

### GIVE THE DEVIL HIS DUE

by Sheldon Emry, one of his best works.

#127 @ \$19.60



book that needs to be revised. It is a wise book - a book for all time. 'It comes nearer being a classic than any other book on teaching ever written in America.' (Hinsdale). A teacher who has not mastered his *Page* will someday be as ridiculous as a lawyer who has not thoroughly thumbed his *Blackstone*."

Now we all know that Mr. Blackstone has been long forgotten in most legal circles, but I will have to leave that discussion for another article. Today let me suggest that if you wanted to find a "good" government school, you would have to look for one that has teachers who have "mastered" what Mr. Page had to say. Here is a small sample of the wisdom that Mr. Page wanted to impart to the *government* school teachers of his day:

#### PAGE ON EDUCATION

*Education of the heart is confessedly too much neglected in all our schools [Mr Page wrote this in 1847!]. It has often been remarked that "knowledge is power" and as truly as that "knowledge without principle to regulate it may make a man a powerful villain." It is all-important that our youth should early receive such moral training as shall make it safe to give them knowledge. (51)*

#### PAGE ON AMERICA'S CHRISTIAN HISTORY

We live in a Christian land. It is our glory, if not our boast, that we have descended from an ancestry that feared God and revered His word. Very justly we attribute our superiority as a people over those who dwell in the darker portions of the world, to our purer faith derived from that precious fountain of truth - the Bible. Very justly, too, does the true patriot and philanthropist rely upon our faith and practice as Christian people for the permanence of our free *institutions and our unequalled social privileges. If we are so much indebted, then, to the Christian religion for what we are, and so much dependent upon its lifegiving truths for what we may hope to be, - how important is it that all our youth should be nurtured under its influences!* (55)

#### THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

*When I say religious training, I do not mean sectarianism. In our public schools, supported at the public expense, and in which the children of all denominations meet for instruction, I do not think that any man has a right to crowd his own peculiar notions of theology upon all, whether they are acceptable or not. Yet there is common ground which he can occupy and to which no reasonable man can object. He can teach a reverence for the Supreme Being, a reverence of His Holy Word, for the influences of His Spirit, for the Character and teachings of the Saviour, and for the evil of sin in the sight of God, and the awful consequences of it upon the individual. He can teach the duty of repentance and the privilege of forgiveness. He can teach our duty to worship God, to obey His Laws, to seek the guidance of His Spirit and the salvation by His Son. He can illustrate the blessedness of the divine life, the beauty of holiness, and the joyful hope of [the Kingdom of] heaven, - and to all this no reasonable man will be found to object, so long as it is done in a truly Christian spirit. (55)*

#### DAVID PAGE ON THE "RESPONSIBILITY OF THE TEACHER"

*The school is no place for a man without principle; I repeat, THE SCHOOL IS NO PLACE FOR A MAN WITHOUT PRINCIPLE. Let such a man seek a livelihood anywhere else; or, failing to gain it by other means, let starvation seize the body and send the soul back to its Maker as it is, rather than he should incur the fearful guilt of poi-*

*soning youthful minds and dragging them down to his own pitiable level. If there can be one sin greater than another, on which Heaven frowns with a more awful displeasure, it is that of leading the young into principles of error and the debasing practices of vice (53, 54, emphasis in the original)*

Perhaps somewhere in the United States, there may yet be some rural school districts that still use Page's Theory and Practice of Teaching. Perhaps not. Perhaps somewhere there are groups of parents willing to do the hard work of winning school board elections and fighting unions and bureaucrats to establish local schools that will apply Page's principles and provide a good education for the children attending there. Perhaps. But until such battles are fought and won, may I suggest a good private school or home-schooling as the better, if not Biblically obligatory, alternative? \*\*

#### THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO PROVERBS by Greg Uttinger

**Every man is like the company he is wont to keep.- Euripides.**

**Sooner or later everyone has to decide which gang they belong to. - Pepper.1**

It is strange that more Christian educators have not tried to work out an educational theology from the Book of Proverbs. The book professes to be instruction for the pursuit of wisdom and knowledge, and yet few books on Christian education make any use of its material and themes, except perhaps in the area of character training.

It may be because Proverbs does not directly address what we generally consider academic topics: mathematics, natural science, literature and such. Or it may be that Christian scholars don't quite know how to fix the book into the framework of the New Covenant.

One commentator, for example, sees Proverbs as law for the Jewish Millennium [where did he come from? CIM] - practical rules, but lacking in grace; another sees the book as an inspired transcript of natural law, good advice for everyone, as it were. Both recognize the relevance of Proverbs to the practical issues of life; but neither can find in it any connection to the gospel of Jesus Christ. [aren't they part of The Word - which was made flesh? CIM] Those who find in Proverbs more of Ben Franklin than of the Spirit of God have also missed the point.

*"The fear of the LORD is the beginning of knowledge,"* Solomon tells us (1:7). The fear of the Lord is basic to the gospel. In fact, in Revelation an angel preaches the "everlasting gospel" to the whole world with the words, "Fear God, and give Him glory" (14:7). The fear of God cannot be taught by the precepts of men (Isa 29:13); it is the work of God's Holy Spirit (Isa 11:2-3). True wisdom and knowledge, then, begin in a right relationship with God, in regeneration, justification, and adoption. If we do not know God - that is, if we do not have a proper relationship with Him - we cannot know His world or ourselves properly.

Good Calvinists should, of course, say amen to this. But then Solomon turns away from traditional Reformed philosophy. He says nothing about worldviews, antithesis, or the Creator/creature distinction. Instead, Solomon tells his son that he needs to listen to his parents' law and stay away from gangs [editor: see the above quote from Pepper.]

Why his parents' law? Why not God's law? Because



the young man is young. He has not mastered all of God's law yet. He does not know how to apply it to the more complex problems of life. He needs direction from those who do. At this point he is (apparently) still under his parents' authority. And even when he passes beyond that relationship, he will still need to honor his parents and their wisdom. Godly tradition has its uses. *Sola Scriptura* does not mean our fathers have nothing to say to us or that we have nothing to learn from them, at any age.

Now, this assumes that the young man's parents are godly and that their law is a valid interpretation and application of God's law. Since the father speaking in these verses is King Solomon before his fall, he can speak with an assurance that we do not have. He was the wisest of men and a prophet, and we are neither. Worse, we are often ignorant of the most basic principles of God's law. [what the author seems to have missed here, though, is that while Solomon may have written the words, we do believe they came under inspiration from God! And also, the instruction to obey parents didn't include the proviso 'only if their instruction is in accordance with God's Law'! CIM] Nonetheless, Solomon tells us how young people should be able to begin their search for wisdom: they should learn wisdom at their parents' feet.

#### "GANGS"

Then Solomon turns to the lure of "gangs." In some other era this might seem odd, but God often uses extreme examples to make His point. We need to know that there is more to wisdom than postulates and systems. What we believe and how we think will be shaped by the companions we choose. This is fundamental. "He that walketh with wise men will be wise: but a companion of fools will be destroyed" (Prov 13:20). God plants believers in churches for many reasons, but this is one of them. Young people who value ungodly friends above godly parents place themselves on the road to folly (as some themselves can no doubt attest to) Slowly - or suddenly p they will find their parents' beliefs outdated, narrow, and even oppressive. Our worldview is shaped in good measure by our choice of companions. We pick our identity by the company we keep.

#### WISDOM

Leaving "gangs" behind, Solomon shows us at least that most excellent lady, Wisdom, Everywhere men gather, she calls out to them, offering them her words and spirit. The young man must listen to her, seek her, and love her (2:1-4, 4:6). For she is "the principal thing" (4:7); she is the Tree of Life restored (3:18). We should begin to suspect who she really is.

The visible effects of embracing wisdom are first of all ethical and social. Wisdom keeps the young man from bad companions, from the froward man and the strange woman (2:10-20). Doubtless, wisdom has its academic consequences, but Solomon ignores these. Of first consequence for Solomon is his son's choice of companions, especially his choice of a bride. For every prince needs a princess. Proverbs shows us two potential brides: Wisdom, who puts on flesh in chapter 31 as the Excellent Wife, and Folly, who is incarnate throughout the book as the strange woman.

"Strange" here means foreign or alien to God's covenant. Though the strange woman is apparently an Israelite, she has forgotten "the covenant of her God" (2:17). She is

not necessarily a prostitute, though she dresses like one (7:10), but she is a seductress and her paths lead to hell (7:27). She is the chief stumbling block the young man is likely to find in his walk with God. But as the young man embraces Wisdom, he will avoid any connection with the strange woman.

Wisdom in Proverbs is a Person, not an abstraction. Wisdom hates, loves, promises, leads, and commands (8:1-21). Wisdom has wisdom (8:14), an odd thing if she were merely a divine attribute personified. Wisdom is eternally begotten. "The LORD possessed me in the beginning of his way, before his works of old," she says (8:22).<sup>2</sup> The Hebrew verb is the same used by Eve when she said, "I have gotten a man from the LORD" (Gen 4:1); gotten, that is, by generation. Indeed, Wisdom tells us twice that she was "brought forth" before creation (vv 24,25) - from eternity. Yet Wisdom was "by" God and "before him" (v 30). Wisdom is the divine Logos (Jn 1:1-18), Wisdom is Jesus the Anointed (cf. Luk 7:35; 1 Cor. 1:24, 30; Col 2:2-3).<sup>3</sup> The man who would be wise must listen to Christ, seek Christ, and love Christ.

#### ANOINTED

Now we can step back and look at the book of Proverbs as a whole. There is nothing of Ben Franklin or Aesop here. The words of this book are the words of divine Wisdom: they are the mind of Jesus and a transcription of His character.<sup>4</sup> He is the wise Son, the Wise in

heart, the just and righteous Man, the One who walks uprightly, whose mouth is a well of life. He is the merciful Man, the true and faithful Witness (cf Rev 1:5). He above all others, has found "favor and good understanding in the sight of God and man" (3:4; cf. Luke 2:52). As we hear Him, as we take His words into our hearts (2:10, 3:1, 4:4, 21, 7:33), we become like Him. Communion produces conformity (cf Rom 6.). The Disciple Becomes as His master (Luke 6:40), There Is No Legalism or moralism here: this is true spiritual religion.

And so the young man must seek Wisdom on two levels, or in two ways. First, he must seek to know Jesus Anointed, so that he may be wise, so that Jesus may be formed within him. (Gal 4:19), Second, he must seek the Anointed in his bride. Moreover, he must do the first so that he can do the second.<sup>5</sup> This is, perhaps, why Wisdom is feminine in Proverbs: it is in their wives that godly men find or should find the clearest and dearest personal representation of Jesus Christ. In chapter 31, the prince finds his bride: and they will live happily ever after

What, then, are the means of seeking Wisdom? Wisdom is everywhere (8:1-3), and general revelation has much to tell us about our Creator. But the words of Wisdom are more important still. Wisdom cries by her maidens, her appointed officers (9:3). We must submit ourselves to the pastors and teachers Jesus has established in His churches. Wisdom calls us to a banquet of bread and wine (9:5). This feast and the Lord's Supper point to the same reality, and we must see Jesus at His table as surely as the young man must seek Wisdom at hers.<sup>6</sup>

What we are talking about is communion, and for the creature, communion with the Creator must mean worship (3:9). More than a rational creature, man is a wor-

#### New Tapes:

- D-027 **Intercession** - Sons of Abraham, 4
- D-028 **Unconditional Surrender**-Abraham 5
- D-029 **Generational Purity** - Sons of Abr. 6
- D-031 **Divine Unity** - water, fire & sword 1
- D-032 **Divine Worldview** - water, fire & s 2
- Pastor *Lawrence Blanchard*.
- K-405 **The Death of Saul**, 1-Character - 23
- K-406 **The Death of Saul**, 2-Character - 24
- K-407 **From a 'Saul' to a 'Paul.'** -Charact 25
- K-408 **Does Virtue Remain in Success?**
- Character of Saul & David series, 26.
- Pastor *James Bruggeman*



shipping creature. Any educational philosophy that calls itself Christian must reckon with this. Moreover, man is a covenantal creature, one whose perception of truth is shaped by his relationships with God and other men. And so, if we would be wise, we must decide what "gang" we belong to. We must know whom we serve and whom we trust. Any approach to education that does not mention all of this up front still has one foot in the Enlightenment.

**Notes:**

1. Terry Pratchett and Neil Gaiman, *Good Omen* (London: Corgi Books, 1990), 343.
2. The Latin Vulgate renders the verb as *created*, and the Arians, recognizing Wisdom as the Logos of John 1, used this mistranslation to argue for the creaturehood of the Son.
3. See Charles Bridges's arguments on this point, especially in his footnotes on 1:20, 28 and 8:1.
4. As the Psalms give us Jesus singing God's Law-word, the Proverbs give us Jesus meditating in God's Law-word.
5. The Excellent Wife in Proverbs 31 often intimidates

young women. But let's put things in perspective. Women are given their example in twenty-two verses; young men get the rest of the book to tell them how to be worthy of the young woman.

Note the two women, the two banquets in ch. 9, and the revelation of the bride at the end of the book. We should not miss the parallels to the Book of Revelation. \*\*

Courtesy Chalcedon Report, Box 158, Vallejo CA 95251-9989

**IT'S ABOUT TIME - THE SABBATHS - PT 6**

by Adam de Witt continuing in chapter 9:

Both the Saturday and Sunday cycles are not from the Bible, but from the hearts of men. God promised that keeping His Sabbaths would be a blessing to us. This is so true for many reasons, for the Chief of Sabbaths can only be done if we understand and know God's Laws. The two are interwoven. To separate them is folly.

When Jerusalem was re-founded under Ezra and Nehemiah, it was at peace for some 150 years. But the 150 years was a kindness (grace) period. It was a time that God showed kindness, not because the folk were righteous, rather it was a time given to the remnant Israelites to put the land in order lest it be foreclosed on by God. Despite Ezra's efforts, the laws of God and the feasts were compromised. Although Sabbaths were strictly held under Ezra, the Chief of Sabbaths were soon muddled. To prove the point, God raised up Ptolemy after the death of Alexander (324BC) who surprised the Judeans on the Sabbath day. The remnant Israelites believed that their Sabbaths were the right Sabbaths, just as they do today. Believing they were right, they felt it wrong to fight on the day they had hallowed. But the day was not hallowed by God! Ptolemy struck on the Judean Sabbath. Meeting no resistance the town was plundered and a great number of its dwellers were carted off to Egypt. During the Maccabean war against the Syrian army in 1167BC, some Judahites would not fight on their Sabbath lest they defile it. They said, "**let us die in our innocence.**" They were surely pious, they surely died but they were not right. So the Syrians rose upon them on the Judean Sabbath. Guess who rose up the Syrians? God! Judeans, their wives, children and cattle were slain in their droves (see 1 Macca-

bees 2:34-38). Remember, if Israelites are with God, who can quash them? No one. In 63BC the Roman General Pompey (the Great) came against Jerusalem and by taking advantage of the Judean Sabbath he was able to take the stronghold. Herod the Great did likewise in 37BC and took the town on "the day of Saturn." The outcome? Wealth was plundered and Jerusalem's dwellers died in their thousands, survivors were to be ruled by their arch foe, Herod the Edomite .... all thanks to the Judean sabbath. God not only saw the Saturday Sabbath as nothing holy, He raised up armies to prove the point. Sure the Israelites were sinners. So surely God could have raised the foes on other days. No, He chose the Sabbath (of man). The last fall of Jerusalem was also on a Sabbath. Vespian overwhelmed the Judeans by attacking on Saturn's Day 70AD.

A Talmudic tradition teaches that Moses supposedly once said, regarding the most fitting day for a Sabbath was, "**the seventh day, sacred to Saturn; work done**

**upon this day never fares well.**" As if Moses would come up with such laughable utter tripe. Of course Moses never said this, but it shows the depth of the frowardness of the Jew stupid-stition. A stupid-stition not only taken up by Edomites who form the bedrock of today's Jews, but also by most Judeo-Christians, and some Identity people, too!

Despite all this, some folks even to this day believe that God and Jesus respected the Jewish Sabbath/Feast system. If you really want to be dumbfounded, then read the utter drivel from the Armstrong-(and its offshoots, one of which is *Living Light* in South Australia)-Judeo cult. In the glossy 'Royal Vision' of March/April 2001 they try to teach us what God's sacred calendar is. Taking their cue from Judaism they go one step further in frowardness than any one else. Yes, the Sunday-ites and Saturday-ites are wrong ... I hope you can see that by now, but Armstrong's-(Flurry's) Philadelphia Church of 'Gog', is twice as wrong and twice the 'child of damnation.' (the punishment for Jewish proselytes). They actually call the Jewish/Babylonian moonstruck year-teller a "**sacred calendar, ... preserved by the Jews as the scriptures state.**" Armstrong's mob tell you that Romans 3:2 proves this. So go and check out Romans 3:2 and it does not in any way claim that the Jewish calendar is sacred or godly; in fact it is not even mentioned. This Armstrong-Judeo cult, twists the words 'oracles of God' to mean that the Jewish/Babylonian calendar was given by God as part of His law. I don't know about you but I feel like kicking these creeps a mile. Furthermore, this 'Church of Gog' insists that we must follow the Jewish lunatic calendar .. you may now laugh. Well, I'll keep their article as evidence to be used against them.

Chapter 10 - When A Day Begins

I have read many tales as to when a day itself was to begin, such as A) when the Sun touched the horizon and B) at high noon (taught by Peter J. Peters), the former being the most common. I always had problems with this because folks in dramatic landscapes such as in Switzerland would have some real problems with this. Those

**IDENTITY**

**Identifying God's Chosen**

The media credits them with building and fueling the tax protest movement, the immigration protest movement, the militias, the common law courts, anti-gun control and the current storm of protest against multiculturalism and affirmative action. The media and special interest groups have maligned them, smeared them and accused them of hatred and racism and of having a theology of hate. In this documentary, you will hear from them - the leaders and pastors in America's churches who teach the Christian Israel Identity message (Peters, Barley, E.Jones, Ramsey). Then you can decide for yourself if these men are messengers of hate or if America in general and the media in particular are so far off base that they cannot see the similarities between these Christians of today and those of early America and the Book of Acts. This is a 58-1/2 minute documentary shown to millions of Americans over cable television, home video sales and rentals. **VIDEO #CI-257 @ \$25.00**



who live in narrow deep dales, hedged by mountains rising a few thousand feet, would see the Sun set (if 'set' means - drop behind the horizon) at least a few hours earlier than their highlander kin who would only live (as the crow flies) as few miles away. If they'd set clocks to this, then real chaos would follow. I can't see how God, who is so careful to give attention to detail, would come up with a worse system than what we currently have. Folks who live in wide open spaces are not aware of such extremes, but million of Israelites live in such regions.

Another argument is this: that at the very point the Sun begins its downward course from 'high noon' the sun begins to set. The point being that they take the word 'set' to mean, 'to go down.' Yet here is another problem, namely, half way or three quarter way through, say, Tuesday, suddenly at lunch time or at afternoon tea, it would be Wednesday. Do you then wish everyone 'Good morning'? Basically its like believing that daybreak comes after sunset! How confusing. But is God the author of confusion? No! But man is. Particularly men of Babylon.

By now I am hopeful that you can see that the Jewish Sabbath system is the Babylonian one, thus one of confusion. If the Babylonians were way out of time with God's order, then why would they be right as to the time a day begins? If 50% of what Judeo-Christian teach is make believe and the other 50% is a pack of lies, then how much would this be apt to the Jewish traditions! The Jews basically follow the Babylonian year-cycle, month cycle, week cycle and yes, day cycle .. at least they are steadfast. So why do some agree with Babylonianism?

Babylonians were once Semites, namely, Nordic whites, they were our kin. But they loved other races, became a melting pot and soon no truth could be found in them. "*The Babylonians, at an early stage, used twelve equal fractions of the day measured from sunset to sunset.*" Time & the Calendar, Syney University Press, 1975.

The New Encyclopedia Britannica 15th Edition tells us, "*The Babylonians, Jews and Greeks counted a day from sunset to sunset.*" The melting pot Judahites in Judea, around the time of Jesus Anointed, reckoned their days to a Babylonian pattern. Because Judea is a Biblical land, it is too readily taken as a given that whatsoever was done there was also of the God of Israel. This is laughable and outrageous. This form of reasoning is like saying Kosherdale (Hollywood) sitcoms give American humor when really it is Jewish humour, or saying that rap is American music when it is in fact kaffir tripe. Judaizers slap their assumptions of the Jewish daybreak at sunset upon this verse, Lev 23:32,

*"from even unto even, shall you celebrate your Sabbath."*

Yet in the context this verse deals with the 'day of covering' (Atonement), it is an instruction on how to hold the feast, not how to reckon days. It would be quite wrong to take this instruction and try to make it fit a way of reckoning the start of a day, or all days. It simply tells us to hold the feast. Likewise in the case of Exodus 12:10,

*"...at even you shall eat unleavened bread."*

The verse is simply telling when to eat the Passover bread, namely at evening time or at the evening meal time. It is not a cryptic clue as to when the day itself begun. But for those who do not understand the feasts and God's year-teller

these verses are so easily taken the wrong way. The rest of the verse tells us what day of the month the feast is, but it does not tell us the time the day started.

All other verses which are used to uphold the teaching that the day begins at sunset (behind the horizon) are all misused the same way. All these verses only uphold the time when to keep meals or offerings, for religious means were held in the evening ... namely, they were evening meals. It's that simple. Otherwise they'd be morning meals, i.e. breakfasts ... in the evening! You'd say 'Good morning' just before going to bed. Well that may be logic to some ... but not to me.

[I remember quite a number of years ago, talking with a Seventh Day Adventist pastor in Adelaide, who was telling me about the 'sunset to sunset' Sabbath - you know, it's funny, but the sunset to sunset only seems to apply to their sabbath day, and not to the other days of the week! Anyhow, I was studying navigation at the time, and had a copy of the Nautical Almanac. I showed him that the times for "sunset" as printed in his church bulletin were out by about 15-20 minutes, when compared to the official "sunset" times as printed in the almanac for that latitude. He went red, stormed out and never came back, HR-CIM]

The Israelites used many 'dividing-times' within a day; 'evening' was but one of many ... others included, 'morning,' 'noonday,' 'the dawn,' sunrise,' 'heat of the day,' 'the two noon's,' 'about 9 o'clock,' 'the cool of the day,' 'the first watch,' 'the middle watch' and 'the morning watch.' 'Evening' was thus only one way they marked time in a day. Never did it mean the start of the day.

The word 'evening' is translated from the Hebrew 'ereb' which means 'dusky time.' This can also be in the morning at sunup. In Exodus 12:18 we are told to hold the feast of Passover:

*"In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at even ..."*

What we see is that the evening belongs to the 14th day. Think this through: the 14th day is already in full swing and then it is the evening of that day. If the evening was the beginning of the 14th day this would make no sense as the feast is held at the day's end, not its beginning. Read the verse again and leave out "of the month" and it reads thus, "on the fourteenth day at even."

The feast was to start at even, not the day's beginning, only the evening's beginning. Let us look at this from the way we are to hold the 'Feast of Covering' (or 'Atonement'). In Leviticus 23:27 we are to hold the feast on;

*"... the tenth day of the seventh month...."* - but as to when the feast was to be observed, vs 32 says:

*"... in the ninth day of the month at even ..."*

So the 'even' or 'dusk time' did not belong to the daylight period afterwards but rather to the daylight period before. These verses basically say that on the evening of the ninth day you hold the feast and carry it through to the next day until evening. It does not say, evening to evening is one day. It says evening to evening included days 9 and 10 to take up the feast. Clearly the 10th day kicked in somewhere between evening and morning, but not at evening itself, otherwise the verses

### New Book

Does the Bible say anything AGAINST interracial marriage? Many people say no.

But the truth may be quite different.

A new booklet,

#### THE SIXTH\* LAW OF GOD

deals extensively with this subject. "Thou shalt not commit adultery" used to read at one time "Thou shalt not adulterate" and is in fact more correctly translated as "You will not mongrelize." 100 pages

(\* this is the sixth commandment in the Greek Septuagint LXX, but the seventh in the Masoretic text) Now available:

**#613 @ \$11.00**



can not behest the feast on days 9 and 10.

The 'sunset to sunset' day is not from God but from Babylon and was part of the whole 'Moon year-teller' (lunar calendar) system. Like the Egyptians, it is most likely that the pre-Babylonian Israelites started the day as we do now; at midnight. This stance is rarely looked into. Folks are all too keen to follow Jewish/Babylonian traditions when it comes to understanding the holy writ. But to understand the Bible we actually need to cast off all Jewish ideas and doctrines (all church ideas, thus all Judeo ideas). Having then shed "Jewish fables" as Titus tells us to do we can then look into what God is 'trying to say.'

Even the most learned and respectful men of the church age were Judeos, they really thought that the churches were the torch holders of Christianity. They, just as many do today, feel we can reach the ministers and change the churches. Then the churches will be 'hunky dory'. Well good luck! For 2,000 years men have tried and failed. The only way for the churches to come around is for them to be wiped out. No, I

did not say their buildings need wrecking, for they are often the best examples of Saxon buildings we have. John Foxe was a Judeo. He did not understand the difference between the body and the church, or groom and bride. All the martyrs he wrote about were brave, no doubt braver than I, but revoltingly churchy; believing in spooks, devils, reincarnation (namely you don't die - you just turn into a harp-strumming spook), a fiery hell and so on [if you believe in the burning hell-pagan doctrine, you should listen to Sheldon Emry's tape series: *The Burning Hell - Bible Truth or Blasphemy?* #A-7604, -7605, -7606 @ \$15 for the six messages]. If any of the martyred

ones were alive today, I bet that after reading my books, they'd persecute the likes of myself, like their persecutors did to them. John Foxe, writer of 'Foxe's Christian Martyrs of The World,' typifies the Judeo stance. On the very first page of his book he wrote this nonsense, "Of all the people who heard Jesus speak, the Pharisees and the Scribes should have been the first to accept Him, since they were so familiar with God's law." What utter tripe! These words were printed in 1563AD. No one seems to have challenged them. Clearly it is a stance held for 1563 years, but no-one has challenged these words nearly 500 years later. Seeing that mostly 'Christians' have read his book, and never challenged these words, it is clear that all 'Christians' must agree with them.

So what is wrong with Foxe's words? Well, where do I begin? I'll keep my point as short as I can and hone in one, "... since they (the Pharisees and scribes) were so familiar with God's Law." All too often we hear folks say, "Well the Jews have the Torah, so the Pharisees and Scribes did too."

The word 'Torah' simply means law. The word does not tell us which law; it can be OT law, but it can also be Babylon's law, parliamentary law, traffic law, case law, ... but only a fore-set word (adjective) tell us which law. In the case of the Scribes and Pharisees, the law was Talmudic law, or Talmudic Torah, also called the 'Traditions of the Elders.' Jesus told the Pharisees that they fordid (destroyed) God's OT Law (or OT Torah) with their 'Traditions' (Traditions of the Elders). In other words, the Scribes, Pharisees (and today's

Jews) did not go by God's Laws, which they fordid, instead they lived by the 'Talmudic Torah,' not the OT Torah.

Unwitting Judeo's who call themselves Christians, have taken it as a given that the Pharisees lived by the OT Torah, when all along the Pharisees lived by the Talmudic Torah. Because of this, Judeo's have taken it that the Pharisees were ultra pious and zealous for the OT Torah. Seeing that the Pharisees were no good, and Phariseism led to Judaism, and Judeo's believe that the Pharisees were steeped in the OT Torah, then it stands to reason that the OT Torah must be no good. Certainly it is no good for Christians and only good for Jews. John Foxe believed this (as all Judeo's did, and still do). They believed the nonsense that the Pharisees "were so familiar with God's Laws," when in fact they were not. The Pharisees only saw God's laws as something for 'old women, children and fools.' Indeed if the Pharisees believed that the OT Torah was better than Talmud Torah, then they would not have chided with Jesus.

Jesus never taught a new law; He simply taught God's law. Furthermore everyone around HRH King Jesus was astounded at Jesus' teachings. If His teachings were the same as that of the Pharisees, then why would folks be so stunned? The people did not have means to get to OT law, it was not taught let alone cleaved to. In the same way the Bible was forbidden by Catholics (Universalists) for some 1,800 years and forbidden by the Proddies to this day. Yes, that's right; Proddies let you read it but first you must have their church doctrine to taint the teachings. Afterall, ordinary folks are too

dumb to work it out without a ministers' guidance. Sure.

It were the churches which tried to link the false idea that Phariseism is locked into God's laws. They teach that the Pharisees were bad because they stuck to God's laws. Only church laws were fair, but as we have read, by work, that's just what the Pharisees did too, namely, they called God's laws unfair. So like Pharisical law, church laws are also abominations. God spoke of this in Jeremiah 7:10, namely:

"... we have been delivered (saved) to do these abominations."

The churches (the lot of them) are no different to the Pharisical churches which fordo (destroys) the laws of God with their church laws. I'm not trying to run Foxe down. He was a learned man earning his 'masters' in Oxford but he was ordained a deacon of the Church of England and later turning to the Puritans. For all his studying, he believed Christianity to be represented by a church of sorts. Churches however only represent a form of Christianity that fordoes God's laws, nailing them to the cross ... They were nothing more than Judeo's, or 'spiritual Jews.' But then, that's what Armstrong's 'World Wide Church of God' teaches: we must become 'spiritual Jews.' Having gone off on that side track. let's go back to sorting out the truth; something the churches have done so well to fordo. So, on the matter of the Passover, when yet in Egypt (before the outgoing) Moses said, Exod. 11:4-5,

### ***Pamphlets to be Deleted when all gone:***

#### **What is the C.F.R. and Trilateral Commission?**

now only \$3.00 for 10 copies posted

#### **The Plight of the Christian Patriot (Merrill)**

now only \$1.50 for 10 copies posted

#### **The Mark of the Beast (Record)**

now only \$1.50 for 10 copies posted

#### **The Mystery of Israel's Blindness (Record)**

now only \$1.50 for 10 copies posted

#### **The Evil of Usury Through the Ages (Goodman)**

now \$1.50 for 5 copies posted

#### **When Christ Returns to Reign (Record)**

now only \$1.50 for 10 copies posted

#### **Unbiblical Life Forms (Ramsey)**

now only \$1.50 for 10 posted

**all of them only while they last! Be quick.**



*“Thus saith the Lord about midnight I will go out into the middle of Egypt. And all the first born of the land of Egypt shall die....”*

After death had ‘passed-over’ the Israelite first born, but struck down the Egyptian first born, Exod 12:30-31.

*“Pharaoh rose up in the night ...”* and seeing what happened, *“he called for Moses and Aaron by night, and said, Rise up and get out from among my people ...”*

*“It is a night to be much observed unto the Lord for bringing them out of the land of Egypt.”* (Ex. 12:42).

*“...thy God brought thee forth out of Egypt by night.”* (Deut 16:1). It is also markworthy to look at the parable of the 10 virgins. Matthew 25:6,

*“And at midnight there was a cry made, Behold, the bridegroom cometh....”*

The Son of God comes to claim His bride at midnight, just as God in Exodus 11:4-5 came to slay the Egyptians, to save His bride. The bridegroom coming in Matthew 25 is a booths level of the Exodus Passover level. We know this because the parable is to do with a wedding feast. This wedding feast is appointed to Booths. (more on this later).

So the outgoing from Egypt took place at night. The ‘Passover’ itself took place about midnight. The outgoing took place soon thereafter (at night). Once out of Egypt, God said that the Passover feast was to be held on the 14th and the Feast of Unleavened bread, celebrating the outgoing, on the 15th day of the month. Both events were back to back, so too the feasts (Passover/Unleavened bread). Yet both were on different days, 14th and 15th, with the Passing Over at midnight on the 14th. The only way this could work would be if the beginning of the new day (the 15th) took place after the midnight Passover of the 14th. Passover was thus not the beginning of the 14th day but was at its very end. This would make sense on a feast level, for eat and fest on an evening and then ‘recover’ or to bethink things, or to rest, the next day. That is why the 14th of Barleymonth is not the rest day but the 15th is (the Sabbath). In the same way, today’s unbelievers use Friday night to ‘live it up,’ and then rest on the Saturday. (or live it up on Saturday night, and sleep in to rest on Sunday). Likewise with the Day of Choosing or Atonement, the evening meal (to have one’s fill) is the night before, thus one fasts the day after, namely on the 10th.

Charles Weisman points out: **“If the start of the ‘day’ was at sunset, which would have been only four hours before God slew the firstborn of Egypt, then the Passover and Exodus occurred on the same day. Even the Passover meal was clearly after sunset - “they shall eat the flesh in that night” [Exod 12:8]. Although the Passover and the Exodus occurred during the same ‘night,’ God regarded them as occurring on two different days.”** (*Sabbath and The Lord’s Day*, #787 @ \$12.50)

The next Bible quote makes this quite clear. Numbers 33:3,

*“And they (Israel) left from Ramses in the first month, on the fifteenth day of the first month; on the morrow after the Passover the children of Israel went out with a high hand in the sight of the Egyptians.”*

So Passover and the Outgoing took place in the same night, yet Passover was the 14th whilst the Outgoing was on the 15th. “Morrow” is an old term that we no use in, ‘to-morrow’ or tomorrow. Morrow is a good Germanic word taken from ‘Morrogen.’ We see this form in today’s Dutch and German as ‘Morgen.’ The word can mean morning but also, ‘tomorrow’ as in ‘the next day.’ The outgoing is thus clearly deemed as being the next day after Passover. The two happenings took place within only hours of each other, back to back, both on the same night. Passover was in the PM part of that night of the 14th day. The outgoing was in the AM part, then the 15th of the month.

The reckoning that deems when a day starts or ends, is

not at sunset to sunset, but rather from midnight to midnight. It is oh-so practical, oh-so logical. In this way there can be no time differences caused by living in Alps, Dales, Plains or below sea level as in Holland. It may well be that the times concerning the crucifixion given in the Gospel seem to be locked into the sunset to sunset divisions, but this is because the Judeans lived in a Babylonian calendar era and it is therefore recorded as such. In the same way, we record times as per the Julian calendar even though we use the Gregorian one whilst we should be using God’s cycles. Often dates given in history books do not make it clear which year-teller has been used by their writers, the Julian or the Gregorian. When giving dates to events before the common use of the Gregorian year-teller, writers nearly always fail to state if the dates are by Julian or Gregorian reckoning. So just when you think you are given the right date for an event, you may well be many days out, unless you know for sure which system the historian is using. Often one wonders if the historians are aware of this. Furthermore, the Gospels often refer to the Jewish Sabbath cycles, yet this does not mean that the Gospels agree with these, likewise nor do they agree with Jewish day cycles, these are simply the recording method of the day.

In closing, day and Sabbath cycles can only be understood in the setting and context of the accounts. The days began at midnight, the year began at the equinox, the feast days mark patterns and types that teach us God’s out-working with His folk throughout time. Saturday and Sunday were only rest days once every 7 years and both Jewish and Judeo-Christian systems are Babylonian.

#### Chapter 11

The way God’s year-teller (calendar) works is set out in the charts of the following pages. I believe they will make sense after a little study. In the layout, I have shown the Hebrew and Babylonian names which have been given to the respective months. It is wrong to think that the Babylonian names were the ones used by the Israelites at the time of Moses. The Babylonian names came into use some time later and really should only be used for a Babylonian year-teller. Jews to this day use the Babylonian year-teller and related names. I have simply included the Babylonian name system because it is the one used by so many who claim to have worked it all out. (obviously, another reason for Israel’s long sojourn in the wilderness was to cut them off from other people’s year-teller systems, and give them time to get used to their own new system). In that way you can liken this one to their year-tellers. I am against using pagan sources for names, so I have followed the tradition that God brought in with Adam, namely: Adam was to name all things. To take that one step further, all things are to be named by pure Adamites, of pure Adamic culture to ensure a pure Adamic culture, ultimately through the line of Jacob. So as to drive home the point, God tells us time and again, do not learn from the heathen.

Too often when settling a place, Adamic man asked the heathen, “What do you call this,” or “What is the name of this place?” The outcome of asking the heathen for an answer and then remembering, or learning, is that our race has broken God’s behest and learnt a bit more heathen culture. We now have revolting heathen names such as, ‘Kangaroo, Dugong (a type of sea-cow or manatee), Canada, Delaware, Quebec, Otago (a shire in New Zealand), Wagga Wagga (an Aboriginal phrase meaning, ‘Place of many Crows’), Kuranda (a town in North Queensland), Indooroopilly (a suburb of Brisbane QLD) and so on. Because we love this kind of paganism, God says, “Right - seeing as you did not want to name the things at my behest then those things which you did name



I will have the heathen re-name. After-all, you like heathen names so very much, why settle for a few heathen things, don't be lukewarm, in for a penny in for a pound." So Ayre's Rock (a renowned middle Australian landmark) has become Uluru, Salisbury (the old capital of Rhodesia) has become Harare, Southern Rhodesia has become Zimbabwe, Northern Rhodesia has become Zambia, Suid West Afrika has become Namibia and so forth. All around the world, wherever Saxons have lived, this deathwork is taking place. I do not like the ways of these lukewarm fools who have given me the melting pot. I was born into it thanks to their sinful ways of dumping God's Law. So with this in mind, I have opted to dump their Babylonian pagan names instead. Pagan names which mock God's spotless year-teller. Thus I put before you, two Saxon options; an English/Saxon and a Dutch/Saxon. As an alternative to English/Saxon I chose to give Dutch/Saxon to show just how readily the month names translate into other Saxon dialects. This was simply an undertaking to show the ease at which it works in other tongues. - - - *to be continued.*

---

## THE TROUBLE WITH FLAG-WAVERS

### The pitfalls of patriotism and the love of government

R.C. Sproul, Jr.

Patriotism is a learned behaviour, sort of. It is learned in the sense that it is not something innate. It is not as though we are born with a deep love of sin and a deep love of our country. But it's not learned in the sense that it is something we study. Rather it is something that comes to us through a host of unconscious mechanisms. It comes upon us in the same way that the flu virus comes upon us. Only it is more debilitating.

Among the issues in the school wars is the issue on history. On the left are a host of historical revisionists who use the discipline as a means to insert their liberal assumptions into the heads of the little tykes. There is a more passive version of this, and a more aggressive. The more passive is the mere ignoring of our history. Here students are taught all anyone could possibly want to know about George Washington Carver, all the while learning nothing at all about George Washington. The more aggressive will tell us about George Washinton, but it's all bad news. The kids are warned not to be like George, because of his right-wing views.

"Conservatives," of course, object to this kind of propaganda. No, they insist on the same old propaganda that they got when they were in school. They want the tykes to learn about what a bunch of saints our founding fathers were. The want them to genuflect anytime one of the approved heroes' names is mentioned. The left wants a daily litany of repentance for all politically incorrect crimes; the right wants all the children to proclaim their faith to the state.

My concern, as usual, is not so much with the looney left. I'd rather have children learn to be suspicious of the state for all the wrong reasons, than love their country for all the wrong reasons. Rather my concern is with the truth that we respond to the important matter of how we view our country without thinking. We feel, and feel strongly, but we do not do so deliberately. And when the right plays into this, it creates slaves, rather than lovers of freedom. When we adopt the tools of the left, we find ourselves sliding their way in a hurry.

I noticed this phenomena years ago when I held the conviction that one ought not to vote. I reached that conviction (which I have since jettisoned) because of my belief in the power of the vote. I didn't vote because I took the power of the vote more seriously than those who did vote. I couldn't make myself vote for Republicans because I would feel responsible for what they did. The Social Security tax increase that Reagan passed, that would be my fault. The Americans with Disabilities Act, that would end up on me if

I voted for George Bush. Those Supreme Court justices appointed by those men who refuse to protect the unborn would have been placed there by me. I take seriously those bumper stickers that read, "Don't Blame Us, We Voted for Jeff Davis."

But what struck me, as I sought to persuade others of this point of view, was the almost robotic response: "You must vote. You have a duty to vote." It often came out like some magic mantra. And when I asked why I had to vote, I got a repeat of the mantra. "It is your duty." It was rather scary. There was no evidence brought forth as to where this duty came from. No Scripture quoted to demonstrate that God requires this. There was only the repetition of the thesis.

My theory was that these folks had been brainwashed. And I still believe it. The same thing continues to happen when I challenge the notion of pledging allegiance to the flag. What struck me there first was the assumption by my friends that I had the burden in this argument. Somehow people opposite me in this debate seemed to think that I had to prove that we shouldn't do it (which I was happy to do), rather than their duty to defend this solemn vow they wanted me to take. It seems natural to us to swear allegiance to a flag, and the nonexistent republic for which it stands but only because we've all done it so many times. It seems normal because they made us do it every day when we were too little to argue about it.

Suppose that every child in the country, every day of the week patted their head and rubbed their tummy. Don't you think that we'd still all do it as adults? Wouldn't people look at you funny if you suggested that such wasn't necessary? Don't you think such would be frightening? Suppose that all our land were taxed to pay for having this done. I'm not suggesting that horrible things would happen if we all rubbed our tummies and patted our heads. Heck, maybe some good would come out of it; fewer full headed men to make me envious. But when we are brainwashed we ought not to be so concerned with the content.

This is how governments operate. We are in the throes of an Orwellian nightmare but dreaming through a Huxleyan dose of soma. It is much more efficient to gild a cage than it is to reinforce its doors. And so much harder to persuade the birds to flee their captivity. Especially when the birds are trained to sing on cue, like Pavlov's dogs, that they are in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

If you want to be free, you must be deliberate. You must search out the unspoken, and too often unexamined assumptions that frame the course of your thinking on these issues with appropriate fear and loathing over a state that would wash the brains of its littlest citizens. And if you don't want to be free, do nothing, and think nothing. If the government wants your opinion, they'll give it to you. •

Courtesy The Jubilee, Box 310 Midpines CA

---

May grace mercy and peace be multiplied to you! Another month has flown by so fast - even being extremely dry. By the time you read this, the camp will be almost over - small camp that it will be. Those with an interest in coming, but who are not coming this year, should let me know what times of year would suit them best in a 1,2,3 order. It may help plan the next time. Thank you again for all the letters, orders, clippings and ongoing support. All are needed and appreciated! May the God of our fathers Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, bless you and keep you in His gracious care,

