



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 sware 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!*

#210

Newsletter

September AD2003

EXPOSING THE FALSE DOCTRINE OF THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS

By Charles Weisman

In Acts 3 Peter is addressing “Men of Israel,” we’ll start in verse 19,

“... from the presence of the Lord. And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets since the world began.”

I thought of a King James version. If you look up that word ‘restitution’ you’ll find that it actually means to restore; restoration. In fact, if you have any other translation than a King James, it will probably say **restoration** there. No debate about that. The only debate is about what this word means. Now the belief that there will be a total restoration of all things is a major premise of the doctrine of *Universalism*. Universalism is the teaching that all mankind throughout all ages will ultimately be saved and brought into the Kingdom of God, or into heaven. This is so, no matter who they are, what they have done, or what they believe. Regardless of if they be godly or pagan, God’s people or heathen, Christian or antichrist, saints or mass-murderers. Because everyone is to be “saved.” It is also said that God loves everyone, God will redeem everyone, have reconciliation with everyone, everyone will be brought into his kingdom, and so forth. Because all these things are really interconnected.

Now some aspects of universalism is found in every single Christian denomination today. Catholic or Protestant, it is there. Such as “God loves everyone.” That’s basically universalism. Now in a general overview of this concept of universalism, an overview of scripture we find that it is something that is kind of hard to find. You know in the Old Testament we find that God’s favour is always upon one people, **Israel**. Always good things happen to one people, Israel. Nobody really denies that. Its not the Hittites, or the Amorites, or the Philistines, its always Israel.

In the New Testament all the godly things happen to people who are called “saints,” or ‘called-out ones,’ or ‘the remnant,’ or ‘believers in Christ,’ or ‘Israel.’ All these people are limited. They never encompass everybody on the planet. Throughout the Bible, we find a continuing principle of a division, a class division between people. We find the wicked and the righteous; good and evil; those who are saved and those who are condemned; the blessed and the cursed; believers and unbelievers; the sheep and the goats; the rejected and the unrejected. Some would say that somehow, like in acts 3:21, that all this changes, that some new concept or some new principle is introduced. Let’s continue reading in Acts 3 and see what it says. Acts 3:21 referred to Jesus, and verse 22 it says,

“For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. And it shall come to pass, {that} every soul, which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people.”

So apparently not all people are being “saved.” Something is probably being restored that causes people really to be destroyed. God’s Law, God’s will, God’s judgment, or something is being restored. Now it’s not just the Bible, but much of history has this continuing division or distinction of people in the world. You see it everyday. Universalists will say that these things only exist in this age. That in the kingdom age, or in the resurrection all will be the same, all will be saved, all will be redeemed, loved by God and so forth.

Now in light of what the Bible says, and what history and nature reveal to us, it would seem difficult to find a verse that actually says that. But there are many who believe that this idea is scriptural. And with great sincerity write articles and books and give messages on this concept of Universalism. Now I have an article here that I am going to go over and analyze. This is an article that I got off the internet, and I saw this article reproduced on several other webb-pages that promote the concept of Universalism. So I thought it was a good one to analyze. The title of the article is *The Restitution of All Things*, by Pastor George Hawtin, and I guess he is in Idaho. And he quotes Acts 3:21 and says how Peter’s statement was

IN THIS ISSUE:

Exposing the False Doctrine, Weisman,	1
Of One Blood - Acts 17:26, Kennedy,	6
Preparing Sons and Daughters for Marriage,	7
The Loving Art of Spanking,	9
Striking a Raw Nerve, Kuhler,	14

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

clearly a restoration of all things. And he goes on and says this:

"Some will no doubt reply to this by stating, as many do, that Peter was not promising that God would restore everything but only those things of which the prophets had spoken. I wish, however, to show as clearly as possible that the grammatical construction of this sentence declares the exact opposite to be the truth. ... You will notice that in the scripture quoted (Acts 3:21, KJV) there is a comma after the word things. This comma indicates that the clause following: 'which God hath spoken by the mouth of His holy prophets since the world began' - is what is known as a nonrestrictive clause. A nonrestrictive clause is one which can be omitted without changing or destroying the meaning of the principal clause or main statement."

Well if we eliminate the portion we have 'the restoration of all things' leave off the rest. But is it the restoration of all things spoken by the Essenes, or by Pharaoh, or by the king of Babylon, or by Caesar? I think we kind of need that other sentence in there, by 'all things which God spoke by his holy prophets.' Well, he goes on to quote some other versions of the Bible to show that the grammatical construction is the way he thinks it is. He quotes the Moffatt translation, which says, "*That the Lord may send Jesus, your long-decreed Christ, who must be kept in heaven till the period of the great Restoration. Ages ago God spoke of this by the lips of His holy prophets.*" Well, I don't know if that's very conclusive either way, but there is a great Restoration spoken of. And there have been many great restorations in the Bible, revivals and restorations. Another thing he quotes is Young's Literal which says: "*Whom it behooveth heaven, indeed, to receive till times of restitution of all things, which God spake through the mouth of all His holy prophets from the age.*" It's kind of like the King James, it is not really convincing either way.

Now I can quote some things too! Like from the Amplified Bible, which says, "*Whom heaven must receive until the time for the complete restoration of all that God has spoken by the mouth of holy prophets.*" That kind of really indicates that the complete restoration is only of those things that God has spoken of by the mouth of all His holy prophets. And there are some Bible commentaries, such as the Wycliffe Bible Commentary, which says this verse is referring to the establishment of all that God spoke by His holy prophets. So there seem to be two interpretations of this verse. It's viewed two different ways. One is that there will be a restoration of all things that the prophets spoke about, or that the prophets spoke about the restoration of all things. That's the way the Universalists interpret it. The prophets said "all things" will be restored. Now we can look at all these grammatical constructions, and know the fact that the commas were not in the original but were inserted. I think it's more conclusive by the things that I have read, that it should be only those things are going to be restored which the prophets spoke about. Perhaps one thing we should look at, we should let the Bible interpret the Bible. I'm going to look at some other verses that use this phrase, "**all things**," and see how they are interpreted. If they really mean "all things" as the Universalists would have us believe.

You don't have to turn to all these things, all these verses, I just wrote them down here; Luke 18:31;

"*Then he took to him the twelve and said to them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished.*" Now that's sort of like Acts 3:21, worded the same way. Is it to be understood that "all things" that the prophets spoke about Jesus would happen to Him in Jerusalem? Or is it that the prophet said, all things were going to happen to Jesus in Jerusalem? Well we would have to have that latter interpreta-

tion, which said that "all things" were going to happen to Jesus. So that would mean that Jesus Christ was an astronaut in Jerusalem. That's one thing that happened to Him. And He was in a house that burned down and suffered second and third degree burns. And He was elected dog-catcher in Jerusalem. And He won the Jerusalem lottery. And He became a pig-farmer in Jerusalem. It's quite obvious that Luke 18:31 refers only to those things the prophet stated would happen to Jesus. Not "*all things*" literally.

Mark 13:33 is another verse which says:

"*But take ye heed, I have foretold you all things.*"

Jesus is talking to His apostles, and He says, I have foretold you all things. Did He foretell them all things that were going to happen in American history? Or European history? No! Read the context, and He is talking about the Great Tribulation that is going to come upon the people of Judea. But did Jesus foretell everything that was going to happen in the Great Tribulation that comes upon Judea? No. Because that went on for almost two years, and it

would have taken Him two years to tell about every movement and every footstep that happened. He told them all the basic and needed things that they needed to know.

1st Corinthians 6:12, Paul says, "*All things are lawful unto me.*" Are you going to take that literally? Can he become a murderer and an idolater? Is that lawful? Obviously not! And in 1st Cor. 9:22 Paul says, "*I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.*" Did Paul become an idolater to convince idolaters? Did he become a clown, did he become an elephant or a kangaroo? That's what happens if you

take this literally.

Phillipians 4:13, "*I can do all things through Christ who strengthens me.*" Is that to be taken literally? **No!** Because it has to be confined and limited to those things that are according to God's will and plan. You can't say 'well in the name of Jesus I hope everybody in this country dies or gets the plague or something.' And of course there's the physical limitations of this verse too that you've got to apply - some common sense things; you can't say, well, in Jesus' name I'm going to leap up and fly around the moon a couple of times. It is limited, it's restrictive. It's just like that verse, with God all things are possible, is that to be taken literal? Well, it's quite obvious that God doesn't do all things.

But these verses are often quoted to support a lot of erroneous doctrine. John 14:26, Jesus said to the apostles: "*But the comforter, {which is} holy ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things,*" Do you suppose the holy ghost taught the apostles about quantum mechanics, or nuclear physics? Or what the planet of Jupiter is made out of, or something like that? Did he tell them about every single historical and scientific fact that exists, and which we don't even know ourselves? Obviously not! Can't be taken literally.

Mark 4:34, Jesus spoke a parable to the crowd, and when they were all gone, "*he expounded all things to his disciples.*" Again the context of this is something limited. All things about the parable.

Eph 6:21, Paul told the Ephesians that he sent Tychicus to them, who was a "*faithful minister in the Lord, who shall make known to you all things.*" Do you suppose this man really taught them all things? Not literally, obviously!

Col. 3:22, "*Servants, obey in all things {your} mas-*

ONE TIME OFFER-ONE SET ONLY

You must phone your request
"THE GLORY OF THE STARS"
a colour-slide-lecture by E. Raymond
Capt. *This set contains 37 slides, plus an audio cassette commentary about the slides shown. These have largely been made obsolete by videos, but if anyone is interested in this set, you can have it for a sug don of \$25.*

First in, first.....



ters according to the flesh.” Well, if you were a servant, and your master said: kill yourself, would you obey it? Or worship that idol? Not to be taken literally.

Luke 1:3, “It seemed good to me also, having had a perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus.” Did Luke understand nuclear physics, how to play football or build a jet plane? He understood “all things” in regard to the gospel - not all things literally.

1 Cor 14:40, “Let all things be done decently and in order.” So I guess you can worship idols, as long as you do it decently and in order?

Luke 21:22, “For these be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled.” Of course, that’s limited to things written in the gospel - not in a lot of these other pseudo-gospels. It is very limited and qualified.

Now there is other instances in which the phrase “all things” is used, but is not intended to be taken literally; or to be given a Universal interpretation or application. And I have gone through this with other verses like “all men” where the word “all” (which I cover in my book on this topic)[*Is Universalism of God?* #415 @ \$18.50] and show how well it says, you know Jesus was raised up so he could draw “all men” unto him. And how these words are never used to mean everybody on the planet. These phrases like “all men” or “all things” are a figure of speech, which is called a hyperbole. A hyperbole is a figure of speech. It is used as an exaggeration to give a dramatic effect to something. And therefore it is not to be taken literally. And there are many figures of speech in the Bible. In fact, the Bible scholar Bullinger wrote a 1,000-page book on *Figures of Speech in the Bible* [available from **KOORONG** books, #30513 in their latest catalog for \$39.95 plus postage of \$8.45]. There are like over two hundred different figures of speech. It’s kind of like this commercial that used to exist; a man and a wife and a child are in a house knocking on the door and ringing the doorbell, a man comes to the door and says, What do you want it is 3 o’clock in the morning? They said, Well, you said we could stop by at any time. That is a figure of speech - that is a hyperbole. If you take that literally you get the wrong intent.

Now here is a verse that really throws a big monkey wrench into the Universalist system of interpretation. Matthew 17:10, “And his disciples asked him saying, Why then say the scribes that Elias must first come? And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things. But I say unto you, that Elias is come already, and they knew him not. Then the disciples understood that he spoke to them of John the Baptist.” Did John the Baptist restore “all things”? Quite obviously not! But Jesus said he did! Now how are you going to get around that? Now this preacher does address that verse in here, he says this:

“Then they understood that He spoke of John the Baptist, but I am not so sure that this was Jesus’ final meaning. At any rate, the restoration was not to be completed then.”

Well of course there wasn’t a restoration completed then, as far as his understanding of it. But when somebody says something like, Well, I don’t think that is what Jesus fully meant, or something like that; well the wheels better start going around in your head, and you start wondering where this guy is coming from. Jesus said all things were going to be restored by John the Baptist, and that’s what happened, so you just have to figure out what He meant

that. John the Baptist came, and he paved the way for Jesus. He brought the people back the Law, the prophets, and did things like that. He restored all things that were necessary for Jesus’ ministry. He restored all things.

Now the preacher that wrote this article is so sure as to how Acts 3:21 should read, this is what he says:

“Peter was actually saying that all the prophets from the beginning of the world had prophesied that there would be a restoration of all things and that the restoration would indeed be universal and would include all things.” Again he says, Peter was reaching us and all who had ears to hear that there was coming a time of universal restitution and reconciliation in which all things will be restored. Whether they be things in heaven, things in the earth, or things under the earth. That his, and the Universalist interpretation of that.

Does the Bible really teach that? That *all things* will be restored? Well, let’s (for argument’s sake) say that this literal interpretation is correct, the way he has it. So a restoration of all things must mean “all things,” no if’s, and’s or but’s about it. Let’s look at some things. Col. 2:14, says

Christ “blotted out the handwriting of ordinances ... which were contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross:”

If there is going to be a restitution of all things those ordinances have to be put back into place. Many people talk about paradise being restored. A lot of denominations say that, Universalists say that. And that’s OK, but if there is to be a restoration of all things, then the serpent has to be put back into his original status and condition in paradise. John 12:31 Jesus said,

“Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out.”

If there is to be a restitution of all things, then this prince of the world has to be brought back into the world. Throughout history we have had many ages, the stone age, the dark age, the middle ages, the Victorian age, and so forth. They are all gone. They will all have to be restored, because Universalists say so. The Old Covenant was abolished, that has to be restored. Animal sacrifices have to be restored, because there has to be a restitution of all things. The book of Revelation talks about the fall of Babylon. That’s got to be restored. The Roman Empire that fell must be restored.

I could go on with many things like this, but it’s kind of obvious that there is no way there could be a literal interpretation on this thing. It doesn’t mean “all things” in heaven and earth and so forth. There are many Christians that believe that there will be a total restoration of all things, literally. And they never give this thing any other thought than that. In doing so they dig a big pit. And all it takes is a little Scripture and a little common sense to cause them to fall into that pit.

If Universalists tried to say well it’s just godly things that are going to be restored, well the wicked aren’t godly, so they aren’t going to be restored and saved. So no matter how they go they put themselves in a bind that they can’t get out of. If it means all things literally, then all these things I’ve mentioned must be restored. We can see how idiotic that can be. Acts 3:21 means nothing more than a fulfillment of prophecy. All the things that the prophets spoke about will be fulfilled. Do you want to know what that is? Go read it - you’ve got the same book I have.

New Video

AMERICA: DESTROYED BY DESIGN

Alex Jones

The World Order has arrived. The cover-up. What really happened in Oklahoma City. Find out who is taking over our parklands as collateral on the national debt. Big Brother is here. What is the cost of freedom? Watch DPS officers sweat bullets & pray for Alex’s departure. Alex unveils the “Orwellian Future.”

#CI-348 sug donation \$20 or Loan \$6



Further problems, if we go back to this preacher's definition of restore, we find something interesting. He says this, "Restitution, according to the best English usage, means the act of restoring something that has been taken away or lost;" So that's what this means, *taken away or lost*. Let's see, we have to ask how can people be restored to God's love whom God had never loved in the first place? How can people be restored to God's favour, or personal relationship with God, if it never existed in the first place? It never was lost. Paul in Romans 9 says that God loved Jacob and hated Esau, before they were even born. Not because of works. It's because it was His position. God never loved the Edomites, or the Amalekites, or the Canaanites. So how can they be restored to God's love?

The same problem exists with the doctrine of Universal Reconciliation. How can all people be reconciled with God? Just like if your family had a big fight and argued and hit one another, and they break up. How can I go there and make reconciliation with one of them? They can't come to me and reconcile, or anything like that. Only that family group can have reconciliation. Not me, not you, just them. As God says in Amos 3, to Israel,

"You only have I known, of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities."

God punishes Israel (see Sheldon Emry's book by that title, #115 @ \$4.20). God divorces Israel. And there is a need for reconciliation with Israel and God.

Now to further support the concept of the Restoration of all things, this preacher quotes some prophecy. Prophecies about restoration, like from Isaiah. In Isaiah 39 and 40 God talks about Judah's coming into captivity in Babylon and how they are going to be restored. And again in Isaiah 35, it says God will recompense, He will come and save you. Now who is he talking to? These restorations are referring to Israel! But he quotes a lot of these prophecies and says these prophecies undoubtedly prefigure the restitution of all things.

But if these prophecies are limited to a group of people, how is it that the restoration that they prefigure can be Universal? That doesn't make sense. Now he also quotes Daniel 7, and you may want to turn there, this is an interesting and important concept that he is talking about here. And he quotes Daniel's vision of the four great beasts in Dan. 7, which are described as 4 kingdoms. The fourth kingdom is described as an evil empire. We read in vs 11

"I beheld then because of the voice of the words which the horn spake: I beheld {even} till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame."

So no wonder that these people or kingdoms did not make it, they were destroyed. And then he quotes Dan. 7:13,

"I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion {is} an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom {that } which shall not be destroyed."

Now he claims that Daniel says that all people and all nations will serve Jesus, quoting those verses, and that's Universalism. But is that what it really says? Let's look at it again. It says that all nations, all languages, should serve Him. Why? Because dominion was given to Him. That's

why the "all" should serve Him, but they don't.

It's just like the kingdom of any other king. The kingdom of England. Many times people were against the king of England, but he had dominion over them, so they should serve him - so they were in rebellion to him. Israel under the Old Testament should have obeyed God, but they didn't. It's just like in Phillipians 2:9 which says:

"Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him {Jesus}, and given him a name which is above every other name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of {things} in heaven and {things} in earth, and {things} under the earth: and {that} every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ {is} Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

This is basically the same thing that Daniel was prophesying about. But when Paul spoke it, the event had already occurred - this is not future. God already exalted Jesus. So every tongue, every language **should** confess that Jesus is Lord, but it is quite obvious that they don't.

Now Universalists often associate being in Jesus' Kingdom as being saved. Thus every one will be in God's Kingdom at the end. Again in Daniel and he quotes that, Dan. 7:27

"And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom {is} an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him."

Now who has the Kingdom of God? The saints! Now to verify and prove this we're going to

quote from the end of this book, the end of the Bible, the last chapter of Revelation. Now the last 3 chapters of Revelation talk about what is known as end-time things. Things such as the Kingdom of God in the end of the age, the resurrection, paradise being restored, the new city of Jerusalem being established, and so forth. These are known as end-time things. While people may have different understandings of what they are and what they mean, they are regarded by everybody as end-time things. The last chapter of the Bible, chapter 22:14,

"Blessed {are} they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city. For without {are} dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie."

Now here we have this concept of paradise being restored by reference to the tree of life. And it talks about the city; the city of the New Jerusalem. Is everybody in paradise? Is everybody in this city? You can easily figure that out. The Universal doctrine basically has everybody being converted into the righteous. But does that ever happen? Just go up to vs 11, and let's read:

"He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still."

See there is no transformation, no conversion of the God-cursed wicked heathen into the saints of God. They're not put on an equal footing with the saints of God. Universalists say they end up the same in God's eye, in God's presence, in the kingdom and so forth. The Bible does not say this. **It says the exact opposite**. And this isn't something new - it's all through the Bible. Like the parable of the tares and the wheat, the kingdom. What happens

Tape of The Month

S-373 **Universalism**, Pt 1, C. Weisman

S-374 **Universalism**, Pt 2, C. Weisman

In keeping with this article on the Restitution of "all things", Charles Weisman on a previous occasion gave these messages refuting the teaching of Universalism; and this article on tape: S-385 Exposing the False Teaching of **The Restitution of All Things**, Charles Weisman.

this month all 3 tapes sug don. \$12



at what Jesus called the harvest? The harvest He said was the end of the age. What happened there? Was there a transformation? We find out that there is not. It's the same thing in Revelation - the wheat are still wheat, and the tares are still tares. The tares didn't transform into wheat. They didn't stand on an equal footing with the wheat. The wheat Jesus said goes into "My barn," - not a barn, but My barn; which could be taken as the Kingdom of God, or the house of God or the city of New Jerusalem, or something of that order. And the tares are bound up and burned.

This is the end of the age. It's the end because just like any other story that has 'the end', we are not told anymore. So for there to be anymore, somebody would have to add it.

The book of Daniel, then, does not speak about Universal salvation. It uses language that can almost be construed as being Universal, if one foolishly applies a literal interpretation. I saw one example here in Daniel 6:25, which says,

"Then king Darius wrote unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth; Peace by multiplied unto you."

Did king darius write to the Eskimos in the Arctic? Or to the Polynesians in the South Pacific? or to the Australian aboriginals? When we read the next verse, he says,

"I make a decree, that in every dominion of my kingdom men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel:"

So it was to every one in his dominion, which was very limited.

But if you read just verse 25, it says *"all people, and all nations, and all languages, and all the earth."*

A lot of these verses, they are qualified and limited by other verses [or by other passages of Scripture]. To apply a literal and universal meaning to such verses will lead to erroneous conclusions and inconsistencies and false doctrines. Just like it does with Universalism. As with all doctrines that are based upon a literal interpretation, that mode of interpretation becomes self-destructive to the very doctrine that it uses to exist in the first place. So those who promote Universalism use a literal interpretation on 'all things,' or 'all men,' or restoration, and so on. It is the only way that all these divisions and distinctions and acts of selection and rejection by God throughout the Bible. It's the only way it can be done.

Now some of the other arguments used by Universalism are based upon general concepts, and this preacher (Hawtin) uses some of them, too. General concepts such as God's love and grace. God's love and grace are so big that He just has to save everyone.

Another general concept is the will of God. That is is the will of God really in the long run, that all people be saved. Or, they talk about the works of Jesus and teaching and healing, and how this is so great, sort of a prelude to Universal Salvation or something. Or they talk about the power of God, another general concept. That God is so powerful and omnipotent that He will save everybody. Or they talk about the nature of man. Sin is in the nature of man, you know. All men sin, therefore all people are the same. Or they talk about forgiveness and mercy of God. God can forgive anything. That God has mercy on anything. But Paul says that God will have mercy on whom he will have mercy, Universalists say, yes, but later on He's got to have mercy on this guy too!

These concepts are extrapolated out of these generalizations, and are theorized into fact, and presto you've got support for universalism. But of course just about any doctrine

in the world can be supported using that approach.

Now what are some of the problems associated with Universalism? It eliminates accountability. One can steal and murder and rape and destroy, because eventually he is going to stand on an equal footing with the apostles. There is really no need for anyone to be a Christian, if someone rejects Jesus in this life, he can accept Him in the next life and be saved, that's what they say. Even if you blaspheme God your entire life, it doesn't matter. It does not matter if you are a Buddhist or a Christian, you are all going to end up the same. You are all going to be viewed the same by God in the end.

It causes people to accept false doctrines. Why should you refute error, or preach the truth when nothing really matters because you're all going to heaven anyhow? It promotes the mixing of races and cultures and laws. Because religious beliefs always affect social and political policy. The theoretical doctrine of Universalism supports the One World Order concept, new age belief, multiculturalism, and integration, while it negates individualism and nationalism. You might say that Universalism is a new and approved religion. Universalism makes God's final judgment as some people call it, and here comes the apostle Peter; and God says: Well, according to the record Peter you've been one of God's good saints, and been a dedicated servant and taught many people in the direction of my will and way. You've died for the cause, enter the kingdom my son. And here comes another person, and God says according to this record, you're not one of my people, you're

a cursed heathen mongrel. When my people were in a disadvantaged state you murdered and raped and plundered them. You caused rebellion upon my people, and brought them to war. You did many ungodly things, enter the kingdom my son. Why should God have a final judgment if Universalism is true?

Of course it negates many Biblical doctrines, such as, election, predestination, baptism and communion. I'm not going to go into the reason why, you can pretty much figure out why it does yourself.

Now we have to ask this question: Why does Universalism exist? Well the doctrine is very congenial to human nature. It is very appealing to the human heart. It just goes along with our human nature so very well. The same reason that Universalism exists is the same reason that many other doctrines exist. It's not because of God's way, but because its what you want. Its what you wanted it to be in your heart. And that's why Universalism exists. It's not because they read the Bible and found out what God's will and way is. It came from the inner nature of man.

This doctrine also exists because it also eliminates a lot of touchy and volatile issues and questions which are hard to address. My brother or somebody might say, he's led this wicked life all his life, he's a drunkard and he stole and he did this, and well he's going to be saved. What do you do with that? Or my daughter or something like that married this Filipino and now the children are half-breeds, what are you going to do about that? They don't have to touch those questions with Universalism. Because it's all

New Video **DOUBLE-BLIND** **What Science Can't See!**

Lorraine Day, M.D.

Science has become the god of our civilization. If a person with cancer or any other illness in investigating different methods of treatment, he or she yearns to rely on the "best" and newest scientific information. Dr Day reveals: *Why the highest system of medical education in the world, the US system, will NEVER find a cure for ANY disease. *How doctors are becoming "Agents of Death." * How radiation of breast cancer increases your risk of dying from heart disease. *Why true science is always simple and easily understood.

#CI-352 LOAN ONLY, sug don \$6

Why should God have a final judgment if Universalism is true?

Of course it negates many Biblical doctrines, such as, election, predestination, baptism and communion. I'm not going to go into the reason why, you can pretty much figure out why it does yourself.

Now we have to ask this question: Why does Universalism exist? Well the doctrine is very congenial to human nature. It is very appealing to the human heart. It just goes along with our human nature so very well. The same reason that Universalism exists is the same reason that many other doctrines exist. It's not because of God's way, but because its what you want. Its what you wanted it to be in your heart. And that's why Universalism exists. It's not because they read the Bible and found out what God's will and way is. It came from the inner nature of man.

This doctrine also exists because it also eliminates a lot of touchy and volatile issues and questions which are hard to address. My brother or somebody might say, he's led this wicked life all his life, he's a drunkard and he stole and he did this, and well he's going to be saved. What do you do with that? Or my daughter or something like that married this Filipino and now the children are half-breeds, what are you going to do about that? They don't have to touch those questions with Universalism. Because it's all



going to end up the same anyhow. It doesn't matter.

But the bait exists, and I see the bait on both sides of this issue, because there is a misunderstanding of a lot of terms. Terms such as hell, saved, and salvation, eternal, ages, what do these words mean? There is misunderstanding of these words on both sides of the issue. That's one thing that perpetuates this, because of the understanding of these terms. They have a pre-conceived understanding of what they mean.

Universalism is definitely an old concept. You find it going all the way back into Israel's history. Many times Israel had opted for Universalism, and they suffered the consequences every time. God you don't really mean that we should destroy all these Canaanites, even the little baby Canaanites? They had to reason out Universalism in their hearts, and go against the will of God. It's an issue that's in much of all of history today. American history, European history. It's in our lives, in our communities, in our churches, in our nation. It is something that is going to be a very focal point in what's going to happen in the near future.

So I hope that something in this message will help you to discern things in your life and your nation and your community, on this matter. **Thank you.**

'OF ONE BLOOD' - ACTS 17:26.

Arnold Kennedy

Acts 17:26 is a verse which some people like to use to support the idea that there is no difference between races.

"And hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation." KJV

Three immediate points need to be made.

1. In the majority of Bible manuscript texts, the word "blood" is not there. A look at most parallel Bibles, will give some confirmation of this.

2. This verse is an excellent demonstration of how people can try to use one part of a verse to prove their point, but at the same time ignore the rest of the verse which flatly contradicts what they are trying to say. The second part of the verse is stating that God made "boundaries" where differing peoples/races were ordained of God to live separated from one another. People cannot have it both ways.

3. The strange and very unusual thing about this verse is that it contains four words in Greek **forms** [not English words] that do not appear elsewhere in the New Testament, and this gives rise to doubts about the whole verse. Some say that the verse does not seem to be original because of this.

These words are:

Appointed, Habitation, Bounds, Face of the earth.

There are no other words in other verses to compare scripture with scripture, in order to be authoritative. In the Old Testament the differences between "earth" and "face of the earth" are very important ... [e.g. where Cain went out from the *face of the earth* and became a fugitive and a vagabond in the *earth*. The "face of the earth" is a limited area of the globe. [It is also that limited area covered by Noah's flood, for more on limited area flood, hear, S-103 and S-104, \$10 the two tapes].

One of the problems that arises in a situation like this is that people will not examine what is being pointed out and they will say something like .. *".. we have always taught it this way and we are not going to change."* Tradition or traditional beliefs and interpretations become entrenched and set rock hard in commentaries. It was such traditions which made the Word of God of none effect - [Mark 7:13].

FROM A PAPER BY J.O. ADAMS

Firstly, it has been suggested that the whole verse is doubtful and should be omitted. However, I know of no authority that supports this view. The verse is accepted by:

Westcott and Hort, Panin, Bullinger, the Englishmen's Greek New testament (Stephens' text and the A.V.), the Revised Version, the Concordant Version, the Douay Version, the Vulgate, the Diaglott, Ferrar Fenton and Moffatt.

However, the word "blood," Greek '*haimatos*,' as in the Stephens' text and the King James Version, is omitted by practically all authorities. Bullinger states, *"The texts omit "blood,"* and Scofield agrees with, *"Blood" is not in the best manuscripts.*" Four of the six editions of the Stephens' text (A.V.) omit the word. It is also omitted by the following: Westcott and Hort, Panin, the Concordant Version, the Diaglott, Douay Version, the Vulgate, Revised Version, the Nestle text & the Revised Standard Version, and by Ferrar Fenton. Moffatt has "from a common origin."

Clearly then the consensus of opinion among authorities is that the word "blood" should be omitted as not being in the original manuscript. The following is my translation from the Greek text. I have included a full analysis of each word at the end of this study.

"And He made from one every nation of men, that they should dwell upon the whole surface of the earth, determining assigned periods of time, and fixing the boundaries of their habitation."

It now becomes necessary to introduce an "understood" word to qualify "one" and so indicate what Paul meant when he used this word. Though some do think that "blood" is appropriate, it hardly seems possible that the varied races of men in the nations could have their origin in "one blood."

The word "nations" is important and should not be overlooked. Indeed I consider it to be the key to understanding the verse. Nations should not be confused with races (*genos*). In the plural nations is used to signify "the nations as distinct from Israel."

I suggest that Paul is using "one" to mean " - i.e. one father, or ancestor. Although I frequently disagree with his views, Bullinger supports me in this by stating, *"The 'one' here means either Adam, or the dust of which he was formed."* (I think we may disregard the last part of his statement).

I have no doubt that Adam was NOT the first "man" on this earth, but that he was the progenitor of the Adamic or "white" race. I think too, that it is from that race that all of the world has developed. (This, of course, includes the nation of Israel). However, he was certainly not the progenitor of all the races on this earth. It would seem that by nature, the pre-Adamic men, being instinctive, and lacking creative or organizing ability, were incapable by themselves of forming nations or civilizations, hence without the influence of the Adamic race, nations as we know them, did not come into existence. It follows that the word "nations" in this verse could only refer to organized groups of men established by Adam's descendants (irrespective of what other races may be included with them).

Adam then was the "one" from (or "out of") whom God made "every" nation of men that should dwell upon the whole of the earth's surface. (Note the Greek preposition *ek* used here. This denotes "from, out of, of," etc. As in this verse, it is frequently used to denote origin).

As the verse must be read in the context of verses 22-24, here is a translation of them from the Greek. It should be compared with the A.V. or the R.V.

"Then Paul, standing in the midst of the Areopagus, said, 'Men, Athenians, I see that in all things ye are very religious, for passing through and looking at your objects of worship, I even found an altar on which was engraved "to an unknown God." What therefore ye are worshipping without knowing, this I am proclaiming to you. The God who made the world (or "order" - kosmos) and all things in



it; the One who is Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made by hand. Nor is He served by human hands as being in need of anything, for He gives to all, life and breath and all things.”

Paul was addressing Greeks, and knew that these people were from the outcast tribes of Israel - his “brethren.”

“And He made from one (man?) every nation of men that they should dwell upon the whole surface of the earth, determining assigned periods of time and the fixing of the boundaries of their habitation, for them to seek God, that hopefully (or “perhaps”) they should search blindly, and discover Him. Yet indeed He is not far from each one of us.”

God was not revealed to all nations. They could only grope (or “search blindly”) for Him and perhaps find Him by inquiry or investigation. Now notice Paul’s change in the pronoun from the third person to the first person. All nations could only “grope blindly,” but to “us” (the Judeans and the Greeks), God was not far away.

“For in Him we are living and moving and existing, as indeed some of the writers (or “poets”) among you have said; because we are indeed His offspring.”

Notice the reason why He is “not far from each of us.” This is “because we are indeed His offspring.”

“Therefore, being God’s offspring, we ought not to suppose the Deity to be like gold, or silver, or stone, engraved by man’s skill and invention. Truly then, God, overlooking the times of ignorance, now declares to the men, that all of them, everywhere, are to repent” (i.e. “undergo a change in frame of mind and feeling”).

God is “overlooking the times of ignorance”, i.e. the time when the Israel people were divorced from Him. Now the men of Israel must repent. These statements, and those in verse 31, are only applicable to the people of Israel.

“Because He has set a day in which He is going to judge the inhabitants of the earth in righteousness by a man whom He hath ordained; {whereof} he hath given assurance unto all {men}, in that he hath raised him from the dead. And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked: and others said, ‘We will hear thee again of this {matter}.’”

The Greek word here for ‘mocked’ is the same as that used in Acts 2:13, and its implication is the same. The scoffers were not of Israel.

“But some men, joining him (or “being on his side”), believed. Among these were both Dionysius, the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them.”

The following are a few of the passages which appear to support my views on this:

Gen. 2:15. Prior to the formation of Adam, we are informed that:

“There was not a man for cultivating the ground.”

By implication - up to this time, although “mankind” had been created (chap 1), there was no one capable of cultivating the soil. Pre-Adamic man was a hunter, not an agriculturist.

Gen 3:20. Eve was so named because she was, “the mother of all living.”

Yet Eve was certainly not the mother of the coloured races of mankind. So too, Adam could be regarded as the father of “all living” - but only of the race that came from

him - not of the pre-Adamic races.

Gen. 4:13. When Cain was expelled from the land of Eden, he complained that others might kill him. The Lord God admitted that this was a possibility and set a mark on Cain to protect him. This implies that there were people other than Adam’s descendants on earth.

Gen. 4:17. Where did Cain get his wife? Though not conclusive, there is no record that she was a daughter of Adam. It is therefore logical to assume that she was a pre-Adamite. He also built a city. Surely not just for himself and his wife! A large number of men would be required for this. It is possible, but most unlikely that the city was built by Adam’s descendants. It is far more probable that Cain “established” a city by organizing and superintending pre-Adamic men to do the work. Scofield’s note to verses 16-22 is interesting:

“The first civilization, the one which perished in the judgment of the flood, was Cainite in origin, character and destiny. Every element of material civilization is mentioned in verses 16-22, city and pastoral life, and the development of arts and manufacture.”

It is also interesting that Cain named his son Enoch, which means “teacher” or “initiator.” The city was named after his son.

Gen. 10:20. “These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations; and from these the nations in the earth were divided after the flood.”

The descendants of Noah were divided to form the nations of the earth. These, of course, were all of the Adamic race.

Gen. 9:19. “These are the three sons of Noah and from

them the whole earth was overspread.”

Deut. 32:8. “When the Most High gave to nations (goyim) their possessions (or “inheritance”), when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the children of Israel.”

Notice that “peoples” is plural. It is to Adam’s sons (descendants) that God sets national boundaries. This agrees with the view that the primitive races did not, indeed were unable to, establish organized communities (or “nations”). This likewise agrees with my remarks on Gen. 2:5 and 4:16. Study EXCLUSIVENESS \$21.95

PREPARING SONS AND DAUGHTERS FOR MARRIAGE

by Rev. William Einwechter

Christian parents are naturally concerned about the well-being of their children in regard to the present and the future. An area of particular concern is that each of their children have a happy and successful marriage. This concern is heightened by the rampant divorce rate and generally sorry state of so many marriages today both in society and in the church. So what can parents do to prepare their children for marriage so that they will be able to enjoy a marriage relationship that is blessed of God and not have to endure the pain of an ailing or broken marriage?

The Precept and Promise of Proverbs 22:6

To begin with, let us consider the well known Scripture of Proverbs 22:6, “Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it.” This text contains an exhortation and a promise for parents



that directly relates to the anxiety we may feel over the future marriages of our beloved sons and daughters. It provides direction and hope for us as we think on the fact that someday our children will be joined in holy matrimony.

Proverbs 22:6 opens with an imperative, "Train up a child." God is saying, "I have given you this child; now, do your duty and train the child!" (If you want to more on how to go about this, I suggest the book **WHAT THE BIBLE SAYS ABOUT CHILD TRAINING**, #405 @ \$23.00 - too many parents are letting their children get by with tantrums, without giving them Godly, scriptural discipline!!!) The Hebrew verb here translated "train" means to imbue, to instruct, make experienced, educate, give training and sound judgment. Interestingly, "train" is related to the Hebrew word for the roof of the mouth (the palate), and its usage in Proverbs 22:6 probably stems from the practice of putting a bridle in the mouth of an animal for the purpose of guidance and training. When God commands us to "train up" a child, he commands us to bring the child into submission to our authority and to fully train him "in the way that he should go." The Hebrew term for "way" indicates a way of living, acting, habits, or manner of life. The phrase "he should go" means, literally, "in accordance with." So, then, "to train up a child in the way he should go" is to train him in accordance with the way of wisdom and truth as given by God in Scripture. Proverbs 22:6 commands parents to train their children to live according to the wisdom of God as revealed in his law-word so that their whole life will be governed by the teaching of the Bible.

This command to parents is then followed by a comforting promise: "and when he is old he will not depart from it." Our Lord assures parents that if they train their children according to his law when the children are young, it will come to pass that when they reach adulthood, they will not turn from the path their parents have taught them. The word "depart" means to turn from the way or course, and is often used in the Bible to refer to a turning from the right path of God's commands (Deut 9:12; Prov 13:14). So if parents are faithful in training their children to walk in the path of God's commands, God promises that their children will not turn away from the right paths of his word when they reach maturity.

The responsibility to Prepare Children for Marriage

The comprehensive command of Proverbs 22:6 should be specifically applied to the subject of preparing sons and daughters for marriage. The text, by clear implication, instructs parents to train up their children in the way that they should go in regard to marriage. Parents are called to teach their children what God has revealed in his word concerning marriage: the nature and purpose of marriage, the roles of husband and wife, family economics, raising up a godly seed, etc. - this is the parents duty under God's Law.

God's promise should also be applied. If parents are scrupulous in educating their children in Biblical principles for marriage, then God promises that when their sons and daughters come to adulthood and are joined in marriage, they will walk in Biblical ways for marital life that they have been taught. As grown sons and daughters live in marriage according to God's word they will be blessed of God and their marriages will be successful from God's perspective. In short, Proverbs 22:6 contains both a command and a promise that should be directly applied to marriage. Parents are responsible to train their children for marriage, and God's promise is that their training will not be in vain but

will lead to Godly marriages that are truly blessed of the Lord

Preparing Sons and Daughters for Marriage

But how can parents go about preparing their children for marriage? What specifically can they do and what areas should their training focus on? Here are some specific suggestions that will help parents in preparing their sons and daughters for marriage:

1. You must lay a foundation for training your children in God's Law concerning marriage by leading them to faith in Jesus Christ and a submission to the authority of his word. As Paul teaches in Romans 8, only those who are justified by faith and walk in the Spirit are able to fulfill the righteous teaching of the law of God. It is the Spirit of God who will "work in them both to will and to do of his good pleasure." Your children must also be taught the authority of God's word to govern all spheres of life, and you must instill in them a Biblical worldview.

2. Train your children to submit to authority. If you do not, then your children will not be able to function properly in the role of husband or wife. If they have not been trained to submit to God-ordained authority when they are young, your sons will have a problem submitting to the authority of Jesus over them as husbands and abuse their authority over their wives, and your daughters will have difficulty submitting to the authority of their husbands. **Unsubmissive husbands and unsubmissive wives spell marital chaos.**

3. Teach your children the precepts of God concerning marriage.

The Biblical teaching in regard to the nature and purpose of marriage and the roles of husband and wife should be inculcated in the minds of your children. Children need to be taught the covenantal nature of marriage, God's plan for husbands and wives, God's plan for children, God's plan for family finances, communication and problem-solving in the home, etc.

4. Teach your children how to work and assume responsibility. Sons should be taught that someday they will have the duty of providing for their family. Daughters should be taught that someday they will be responsible to manage their household. Accordingly, fathers ought to make sure that their sons are diligent in their work, and have the skills necessary for gainful employment; and mothers ought to make sure that their daughters are skilled in the arts of homemaking.

5. Be an example of a Godly marriage to your children. As the saying goes, "More is caught than is taught." The verbal instruction in regard to the Biblical principles for marriage you give your children should be modelled for your children in your own marriage. The importance of a godly example is critically important! Without this, all other aspects of training your children for marriage will be greatly undermined. The adage, "Like father, like son; like mother, like daughter," applies to the manner in which your children will carry out their relationship with their husband or their wife.

6. Expose your children to positive marital role models. In conjunction with the previous point, it is important that your children see God's will for marriage patterned in the lives of others; no matter how positive your own example is, your children will benefit from the example of the godly marriage of others. (This is another good reason for Christian communities where people live in close proximity to each other). Paul exhorted the Phillipians to

Special

BABYLONIAN WINE

by Pieter de Bemiddelaar

Comic-style exposé of the problems of today's society, the clashes of cultures, the causes, the end result and a solution. Everyone should have at least one copy.

#764 @ sug don \$2.25, This month \$1.90 or 4 copies for \$6.00 - order NOW!



follow his example, but he also called upon them to “mark them which walk” as an example of godly living (Phil 3:17). Mark for your children those who walk in accord with God’s law for marriage. Examples of a godly marriage can be drawn from both church history (e.g. Jonathan and Sarah Edwards) and from those that you and your children both know.

7. Begin your training early. Do not think that a week before marriage you can sit down with your child and tell him what he will need to know for a successful marriage! Begin early and teach your children according to what they can understand. Keep your instruction appropriate to their age and progress your training as they grow older. By the time they reach marriageable age, you should have trained them in the way that they should go concerning marriage.

8. Use the marital problems of others as a springboard to teach the blessing of obedience to God’s Law for marriage and the cursing of disobedience to God’s Law for marriage. Today we are surrounded by those who have serious marital problems and by failed marriages that end in divorce. Older children are aware of these troubled and failed marriages. The tragic consequences of disobedience to God’s commands are illustrated in a telling fashion in these problem marriages. Do not fail to use these sorrowful situations to teach and exhort concerning the blessings and cursings of God. Instill in your children the fear of God, which is the beginning of wisdom.

9. Endeavour to keep your children morally pure. The sexual revolution of the Sixties has reaped a bitter harvest in our society and destroyed many a marriage. Explicit sex and moral perversions of all sorts are openly displayed and promoted in the media, advertisements, literature, and art. Your children must be protected from these assaults on the sanctity of the marriage bed that have permeated our culture. Moral impurity is a dangerous virus in marriage. It sows seeds of marital discord and unfaithfulness and works to undermine the one-flesh union of marriage. Keep the minds of your children pure, and with Biblical sensitivity, teach your children the holiness of marital love.

10. Protect your children from the destructive effects of dating. Dating is a humanistic perversion of the Biblical patterns of courtship. Dating does not prepare your children for marriage; it does the opposite. It can lead to emotional scars and moral impurity that will undermine their marriage.

11. Teach your children God’s will for a marriage partner. God’s Law forbids the believer to marry an unbeliever (2 Cor 6:13), and commands the Christian to marry “*only in the Lord*” (1 Cor 7:39). Preparing a child for marriage involves the crucial task of training him to seek a marriage partner from among those who stand in covenant with God through faith in Jesus Christ.

12. Attend a church that upholds God’s Law and teaches the Biblical standards of marriage. What your children are taught at home should be supplemented and upheld by the teaching ministry of the local church. If your children are taught a standard for marriage that is contrary to that which you are teaching them at home, this inconsistency will undermine your efforts and will create confusion in their minds. For this reason, they should be home-schooled, as the school system will most certainly undermine your teaching in this and other areas.

Conclusion

Parents have a mandate from God to “*train up a child in the way he/she should go.*” This training certainly includes the preparation of the child for marriage. Parents also have a promise from God that faithful training in the ways of the Lord will be honoured by him, and he will cause our children to walk in the paths of righteousness. This promise definitely applies to marriage; if we train our

children in God’s plan and purpose for marriage, he will cause them to walk in his ways and to experience the blessing of a happy, successful, God-honouring marriage. Having heard his command, and being armed with a promise, do not fail to train up your children in God’s way for marriage and thus prepare them for one of the most important aspects of life and of taking dominion under God’s covenant law - the marriage relationship.

Courtesy Chalcedon Report, Box 158 Vallecito CA 95251

THE LOVING ART OF SPANKING

Philip H. Lancaster

One of the saddest stories in the Bible is that of Eli and his sons (1 Samuel 2-4). Eli was the chief priest of Israel in the generation before King Saul. It was he to whom the boy Samuel was entrusted by his mother Hannah, to be raised in the priestly family. Eli’s sons, Hophni and Phinehas, served as priests under the direction of their father during the time Samuel was being brought up.

Startlingly, the scriptures record that “the sons of Eli were corrupt; they did not know the LORD” (2:12). What? The sons of Eli, the man who tenderly taught Samuel to recognize the Lord’s voice (3:1ff), did not know the Lord? The priests of Israel were corrupt?

Yes, and their corruption was not of a minor sort. We are told that they utterly disregarded the Lord’s direction for how the sacrifices of the people were to be administered. God in His law carefully specified how the animals of sacrifice were to be killed, which parts were to be burned, and which part the priests were to receive as their share. However, the sons of Eli totally ignored God’s law for the sake of personal appetite. They claimed the best parts of the sacrificial meat for themselves, and if the one making the offering objected, they would simply threaten to take the meat by force. “Therefore the sin of the young men was very great before the LORD, for men abhorred the offering of the LORD.” (2:17). As if this were not enough, Eli’s sons “lay with the women who assembled at the door of the tabernacle of meeting” (2:22). The sin of these priests was notorious. Instead of urging the people toward holiness, they were actively engaged in corrupting them.

So what was Eli’s reaction when “he heard everything his sons did to all Israel” (2:22)? Here is the report: “*So he said to them, ‘Why do you do such things? ... No my sons! For it is not a good report that I hear. You make the Lord’s people transgress. If one man sins against another, God will judge him. But if a man sins against the LORD, who will intercede for him?’*” (2:23-25). This sounds like a righteous response. He rebuked his sons in a way that showed the seriousness of their offenses. But it wasn’t enough. “*Nevertheless they did not heed the voice of their father, because the LORD desired to kill them*” (2:25). [Sons’ pay attention to your fathers!! at any age.]

A few verses later we hear the words of a prophet the Lord had sent to address Eli. He spoke the words of the Lord: “*Why do you kick at My sacrifices and My offerings which I have commanded in My dwelling place, and honour your sons more than Me, to make yourselves fat with the best of all the offerings of Israel My people?*” Obviously God was not pleased! He blamed Eli for his sons’ behaviour and accused him of honouring his sons more than God. How could this be? Eli had rebuked their sin in no uncertain terms. What more could he have done?

We learn the answer when we read the content of Samuel’s first prophecy, which was a prophecy of doom on Eli and his household. “*For I have told him that I will judge his house forever for the iniquity which he knows,*



because his sons made themselves vile, and he did not restrain them” (3:13). Apparently God regarded Eli’s verbal rebuke of his sons as inadequate. Something more than scolding was called for with these **adult sons**. The Lord expected this father to actually “restrain” his sons and put their offenses to an end. He was in the position of authority. His sons were under his control. His failure to get beyond scolding to actually demanding and obtaining a change of behaviour was a sin sufficiently large to call for the most severe of judgments. “*I have sworn to the house of Eli that the iniquity of Eli’s house shall not be atoned for by sacrifice or offering forever*” (3:14). God takes seriously a father’s duty to demand and obtain proper behaviour from his children.

But what could Eli have done? His sons ignored his rebuke. They were adults. Could he have taken them over his knee and spanked them? Would that have done any good? Of course it was too late for that. But that is precisely the lesson we need to learn from this story: a **father must** train his children to **obey** when they are young because it is too late when they are grown. Obviously Eli had been a permissive father and had not made demands on his sons. Oh, he apparently scolded them when they did wrong. But they learnt that this meant nothing. They could go on and do what they pleased with no consequences. They could throw their tantrums and get by with it!

Eli should have restrained his sons’ behaviour when they were growing up; if he had started doing this at a very early age, then he wouldn’t have had to deal with their outrageous offenses when they were older. Even then he should have dismissed his sons and, if necessary, called out the Levites who assisted in the temple work, to remove his sons from their priestly service. He had the power to do that, and that is what the Lord expected of him. But he was not used to restraining his boys and stayed with the patterns that apparently he had long ago established: rebuke the sin, but don’t actually put a physical restraint of pain on the behaviour.

THE ROD: A MEANS OF GRACE

If we are not to repeat the sin of Eli we must learn how to train our children when they are young, and specifically, we must learn how to train them in a way that goes beyond scolding to enforcement of God’s standards of right and wrong. But how is this done? What is God’s method of enforcing proper behaviour on our children? How do we “restrain” their tantrums and actions, even to the extent of taking physical measures to assure results?

The solution offered in Scripture is the rod. “**Do NOT withhold correction from a child, for if you BEAT him with a rod, he(she) will not die. You shall deliver his(her) soul from hell**” (Prov. 23:13,14). Fathers are given the tool of corporal punishment to shape the behaviour of their children. The rod represents the father’s authority (and hence the mother’s as well, since she shares his authority as his helper). It is the parents’ means of physically restraining the bad behaviour of their children and bringing them into line with God’s standards.

Beating with a rod is not acceptable to modern psychologists who **think they know better than God** - what a joke! These false teachers view spanking as a form of violence, of child abuse. Well, it is indeed a mild, restrained use of force and pain (not violence); but it is not child abuse. It is a carefully administered dose of superficial injury which is designed to bring about repentance and a change of behaviour. We know it is restrained since the proverb tells us that the child beaten with the rod “will not die.” The aim is not

serious injury. The aim is pain which results in a change of heart and of actions. “Child abuse” would be defined from the biblical perspective as a **failure to use the rod**. Those who disdain its use **DO NOT LOVE THEIR CHILDREN!!!** enough to save their souls from hell! Just as Eli’s undisciplined sons grew into incorrigible rebels destined for the severest judgment, so any child from whom the rod is withheld is in danger of ‘hell’. That is why another proverb concludes: “**He who spares his rod hates his son(daughter), but he who loves him(her) disciplines him(her) promptly**” (13:24). i.e. Don’t wait.

Proverbs presents parents with the choice: they can give their children a moment of physical hurt or an eternity of being excluded from God’s kingdom. The rod is the means God has designed to transform children from rebellious to obedient. “*Foolishness is bound up in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction will drive it far from him*” (Prov 22:15). A fool in Proverbs is not a simpleton or merely naïve person; he is a **rebel**. So when the

verse tells us that foolishness is bound up within the hearts of children, it is saying that they have a deep-rooted tendency towards rebellion, shown as starting with throwing tantrums of screaming and kicking. It is so deeply rooted that mere scolding will **not** dislodge it from the heart. More drastic measures are required. And God promises that bodily chastisement with the rod will have a beneficial effect: it will drive the rebellion out of the heart. If Eli

had done this to his boys when they were young he would not have had such grief when they were older (something I am sure, many of us can relate to as well!).

This is an amazing truth. In the rod we have a veritable means of grace, a measure that is part of what God uses to transform our children from rebellious offspring of Adam into obedient sons of God. Now there is no gospel grace in the rod itself, of course. The physical instrument of spanking does not have a direct effect on the soul, and many who by spanking in childhood have been shaped into decent, moral adults nevertheless have not yielded their wills to Jesus as Lord and Saviour. Yet God uses the infliction of physical pain by the Christian parent as part of the process of opening the heart of a child to the Lord. How can a child who is stubbornly resisting their parents’ authority possibly be open to the gospel of grace in Jesus? Rebels don’t bow before the cross, and perhaps some parents’ should examine their own hearts for rebellion to God in this area. But as the heart is freed from its mutinous instincts through chastisement, the soul is opened to the further gracious influences of the Holy Spirit which lead a child to salvation.

WHEN NOT TO USE THE ROD

Clearly the godly father will want to make use of the rod since he loves his children and wants to see them submit to the Lord all their lives and avoid the pain of being cast out of God’s kingdom. But when should the rod be used? Do I beat my kids every time they do something wrong? It should already be clear from the scriptures we have referenced that the rod is used to deal with rebellion. “**Judgments are prepared for scoffers, and beatings for the backs of fools [rebels]**” (19:29). Let’s clarify the matter by taking a look at some instances in which the rod should **not** be used.

First, the rod should not be used to correct mere inexperience and childishness. A two-year-old who knocks over a potted plant on the coffee table at a friend’s house is not being rebellious; he’s being curious. (I believe the

New Tapes:

- G-556 Principles of Biblical Economics, Pt 16, Weiland
- D-062 Qualifications for Victory (2)
- D-063 Qualifications for Victory (3)
- D-064 Intro to Galatians, (Gospel 1)
- D-065 Authority of the Gospel (2)
- D-066 Testimony of the Gospel (3)
- (all D- by Lawrence Blanchard)



ability to use a smack starts much earlier than 2 years of age! (CIM) It would not be appropriate to spank him for doing what comes naturally at this age of exploration. Now, if the toddler persists in touching the plant after having been told firmly, "No! Don't touch," then a firm swat on the backside with the rod is in order since the act has been elevated to rebellion due to the command of the parent.

Second, the rod should not be used in response to accidents. When a nine year trips on the steps carrying in the groceries and shatters all but one of the eggs in the carton he is not being rebellious. Perhaps he is clumsy, and this clumsiness can be corrected through training, but clumsiness is not revolt. To spank a child when it unintentionally breaks something may make the parent feel better (especially if it was grandma's china plate that was broken), but it is likely to embitter the heart of the child since he/she senses the injustice of the attack against him.

Third, the rod should not be used when a child exhibits a *lack of ability* to accomplish a task. It would be an outrageous misuse of corporal punishment to spank a child who was having trouble learning how to ride a bike, or whose handwriting persisted in sloppiness despite his real efforts to be neat. The rod is designed to change the heart. It does not create a sense of balance or a steady hand. It can be used to correct a laziness in wanting to learn. For a parent to resort to spanking when a child is reaching the limits of his or her ability in a task is a form of child abuse (though no concern of the state).

The rod is for the back of fools. Its use should be carefully reserved for those times when a child is clearly revolting against authority. Which brings us to the question, How do we define rebellion? What does it look like? Or to put it more positively, What does obedience look like?

THE NATURE OF TRUE OBEDIENCE

My handy desk dictionary defines obedience as both "an act or instance of obeying" and as "the quality or state of being obedient." Someone who is obedient is "submissive to the restraint or command of authority: willing to obey." We get the sense, which certainly agrees with Scripture, that obedience is not just a matter of outward conformity to the will of another; it involves the attitude that lies behind the action. Obedience is not just doing what an authority wants, it is doing so in a certain way. Let's consider the nature of true obedience.

First, true obedience is *prompt* obedience. Children are commanded to honour their parents (Ex. 20:12) as part of their general duty to honour all authority, and ultimately the authority of God himself. This attitude of honour is made evident as children respond to the command to "*obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right*" (Eph 6:1). Is God pleased if He commands me to do something and I take my time about responding? No. True obedience, that springs from honour to God and those He has placed in authority over me, is prompt obedience. God has instructed us to tithe and to attend "the assembling of yourselves together" and I can show by example to my children, my obedience. If the heart is submissive it will cause the child to want to respond immediately when a command is given. Delay and dawdling suggest that he does not want to obey and is putting it off since it does not suit him at the present. Postponed obedience must be treated as **disobedience**. It is not obedience "in

the Lord."

Second, true obedience is *complete* obedience. Just as delayed obedience is an assertion of self-will as to the timing of the act of obeying, so incomplete obedience is an assertion of the will as to the amount of conformity necessary. King Saul did not destroy all of the people and goods of the Amalekites as God had ordered. Even so, he boasted to Samuel "*I have performed the commandment of the LORD*" (1 Sam 15:13). After Samuel confronted Saul with the evidence of his failure to obey fully and rejected his excuses, he asked the king, "*Why then did you not obey the voice of the Lord?*" (v.19). Saul thought 90% obedience was good enough. God had a different measuring stick: He demanded 100% conformity to His will.

If my six year old daughter is told to bring all the dishes off the table into the kitchen and she brings all but the water glasses, that is not obedience, however promptly it was carried out. She may figure someone else should help her. She may decide it would be handy to leave the glasses so they are available for the next meal. She may think a lot of things to justify herself, but 90% obedience is **DISOBEDIENCE!**

The need for complete obedience on the part of a child suggests the need for a parent to be very clear in giving directions. If the command is vague, obedience cannot be exact, and it would be wrong to spank a child who simply did not understand what was expected of him/her). Now of course, we all know that children can take advantage of the situation and claim that they did not understand or did not hear, but that all the more underscores the need to be clear. It is best to have eye contact with the child to be sure your command is heard, and perhaps even to have the command repeated back if there is any tendency for the child to "misunderstand" or "not hear." Requiring a "Yes sir" or "Yes ma'am" as a sign that the direction was heard and understood is also a good idea.

Third, true obedience is cheerful obedience. Here we get thoroughly into the matter of attitude. God is always more concerned with heart attitude than with outward actions, though both are important. The greater error of the Pharisees was in thinking that God only cares about external conformity to His will. Jesus told them they looked great on the outside, like a beautiful tomb, but that inside they had the putrid stench of decay (Matt 23:27). Their hearts were far from God, though they scrupulously fretted about being outwardly righteous. Jesus' most scathing denunciations were reserved for those who thought pleasing God was just a matter of externals and who left their hearts out of their religion.

In announcing the curses He would visit on His people when they did not keep His covenant, the Lord said, "*Because you did not serve the LORD your God with joy and gladness of heart, for the abundance of everything, therefore you shall serve your enemies...*" (Deut 28:47,48). Sometimes God's people grudgingly obey on the outside, but their hearts are not in it. They see God's commands as burdensome and they chafe, even as they obey outwardly. God does not accept such behaviour. He wants those who serve Him to do it with gladness.

Must Reading:

SAVING THE ENVIRONMENT New World Order Style

by Pastor Peter J. Peters

This booklet reveals: *what really lies behind the banner of Save the Environment that is being taught by humanists, environmentalists, bankers and One-Worlders. *the foolishness, stupidity and lies of men concerning the earth and its environment. *how the Bible story of Jacob and Esau plays into the environmentalist scene. *the unmentioned sins that are destroying the planet. *speaks of the forbidden term

"White Race" and the Bible subject of Sons of God

#057 @ sug don \$4.70 or 4 for \$15.00



Our children must not only conform their actions to the commands we give them, they must also do so with a cheerful spirit and without complaint. This does not mean they cannot seek clarification to be sure they understand what is expected, but their attitude must be right. They cannot be permitted to gripe, or to heave a big sigh of disgust, or to roll their eyes, or to scowl, or to shake their heads, or to walk away from us with body language that communicates disdain. Such behaviours clearly evidence an unsubmitive spirit even if accompanied by outward actions of conformity to the direction given. The rod should be used in such cases as surely as if the child had steadfastly refused to obey at all.

To fail to discipline for inward as well as for outward rebellion is to assure that the heart will remain unyielding. The result will be that we create children who learn to do what they are told, but whose hearts remain self-willed, like the child who when told to sit down does so but mutters under his breath, "But I'm still standing up on the inside." If this kind of attitude, however expressed, is allowed to persist, a father will end up producing Pharisees who are outwardly compliant but whose hearts are full of rottenness.

So obedience is not doing what I'm told when I feel like getting around to it. It is not doing what I'm told with a complaining and downcast spirit. Obedience is doing what my authority tells me to do, and doing it promptly, completely, and cheerfully. Anything less is rebellion and calls for the rod of correction.

Now we must deal with the question of what exactly is meant by the use of the rod. What is a rod? How should a parent spank a child?

WHAT IS A ROD?

The rod of correction in Proverbs is not some high-tech torture device. It is simply a stick, a piece of wood. My grandmother from North Carolina called it a switch (the first time I hear her threaten its use on me, I thought she was planning some kind of electrocution, though I did think that a bit out of proportion to my offense). A Hebrew father would take a small branch from a tree, one that was solid enough to inflict pain upon its application to the kind regions, yet yielding enough not to inflict real injury. I have used a dowel rod purchased at the hardware store. (*Rod: #7626 shebet, from an unused root probably meaning to branch off, a scion, i.e. a stick, for punishing, fighting, ruling, walking, etc. also translated as sceptre, staff; Strong's Conc.*)

As in everything, we are safest when we adhere closely to the wisdom given in Scripture. Could we substitute something else for a wooden rod? Perhaps, but why should we? Many parents mine included, have used a hefty leather belt. This choice can be quite effective. The only danger is if the parent gets a bit carried away and strikes the child with the buckle (this happened to the boy next door once - big ouch!). Some use wooden kitchen spoons, or paint stirring stick, but these are too wimpy, except maybe for the bare backside of very small children. Some have specially designed wooden paddles about 15 to 18 inches long, about 2 inches broad and about 5/16 to 3/8 thick, with rounded edges and a handgrip on one end. This seems to work admirably. Others have promoted plastic versions of a rod. My main objection to them is that they will not break. like a wooden stick does, if used too hard.

There is real value in having a unique instrument to serve as the rod of discipline rather than whatever household item is handy. The rod then comes to symbolize the disciplinary

authority of the parents and is used only for corporal punishment. A belt or wooden spoon have other daily uses and are confusing symbols.

HOW TO SPANK

We know when to administer corporal punishment: it is for rebellion against authority; it is also for disobedience. We know what to use to administer that chastisement: the rod. Now let's address the practicalities of how to apply the rod. What is the process we should go through when our children require a spanking?

The first thing to stress is that a spanking should be given **promptly** after the offense. Ecclesiastes 8:11 says, "Because the sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." Just as the child's obedience should be prompt, so the sentence for disobedience should be carried out swiftly as well. Justice delayed is not true justice. "He who spares his rod hates his son(daughter), but he who loves him(her) disciplines him(her) promptly" (Prov 13:24). It is important to connect the crime with the punishment in order to reinforce the fact that actions have consequences. None of this "go to your room, I'll deal with you later," stuff. Do it NOW!

It is also unloving to make the child wait in dread for the pain he knows he has earned. My great-grandfather used to tell his boys when they disobeyed that they had a switching coming. Then he might wait a week or two and suddenly as he and his son are walking along the road, he grabs a switch and tells the boy its time to give that switching he is owed. Talk about exasperating a child (Eph 6:4)! Such a way of handling discipline is sure to tempt a child to despise his father. No, punishment must be swift, immediate.

The spanking should be administered **by the father** if he is present (and by the mother in his absence). He wields the authority of the rod as the head of the home and he should apply the discipline when he is with the offending child. This would apply even if he is in the basement fixing the plumbing while Mom is out in the garden with the children. When one of them disobeys Mom, she should get Dad to administer the discipline. This honours him as the family leader and reinforces to the rest of the family that Dad is in charge. The failure to obey Mom was not only an offense against her, it was also a sin against the father whose authority in the home (delegated to his wife) has been challenged. Besides, the force required for spanking is more readily exercised by a man than by a woman.

Now it is important that the mother NOT become the comforter while the father becomes the bad guy. Nor, in obscene situations, the reverse. She must support his role as primary disciplinarian and not allow any attempt of the child to set the parents in opposition to each other. The child should not be permitted to "play one parent off against the other." As we'll see below, when Dad spansk a child, he himself should end up comforting him(her). Then Mom receives the child back as one properly chastened and back in fellowship, but she should not give comfort in a way that suggests that Dad was either wrong to spank, or too harsh. As the man's helper, the wife must stand by him as he deals with the souls of his children.

When Dad is not home, Mom must do the duty of

SPECIAL

A tribute to Jack Mohr

A JEW SPEAKS OUT #062 @ \$1.85

and

CONSPIRACY TO DECEIVE THE ELECT

#740 @ \$1.75

This month only, get both of these for only \$3
or 10 copies of each for a total of \$25!

ORDER NOW!



spanking. She should use the same force and demand the same respect as her husband (although we can readily see the disadvantage of having fathers away from the home so much of the time). She should not use the line, "Just wait until your father gets home," since discipline must be prompt and she has the right to wield her husband's authority in his name just as if he were doing it himself. Having said this, it is not inappropriate for a father when he gets home to use the rod on a child who has shown a general spirit of disobedience during the day with his mother. Besides whatever spankings the young one received at her hands for specific offenses, his Dad can deal with the general attitude of non-cooperation which constitutes a distinct offense against the authority of the father who has left the mother in charge. "Mom spanked you for not cleaning your room when she told you to, for hitting your brother, and for throwing your sister's doll. I'm spanking you for disrespecting my wife and assistant by not obeying her orders as if they were my orders."

The *reason* for the spanking must be clarified so that the child understands exactly why he (she) is about to experience pain. At this point it would be good to identify not only the specific offense, but the root problem as well: "You threw your sister's doll even though we've told you to leave your sister's things alone. When you do that you are breaking God's eighth commandment (do not steal) which teaches the need to respect the property of others. For that reason I have to spank you. It's the duty God has given me as your father to help you learn to obey God." For the child to be able truly to repent, he/she must understand the offense as a sin, sin against God as well as his sister.

For the spanking itself the child must be put in a good physical *posture* for the act. Smaller children can be laid across the knees or lap. Older children could be told to lie over a chair or the edge of the bed. Part of the child's duty in receiving the discipline is to cooperate with the process and to assume the necessary position without complaint.

Speaking of complaint, the child must have an *attitude of submission* during the process. He/she should not be allowed to protest or resist your attempt to put him/her over your knee. He (she) must have a submissive attitude in accepting the need for discipline and receive it willingly. His (her) carrying on and fighting you would become another offense that requires another spanking. Tell them the amount of spanking will double if they do not cooperate - and then DO IT. Never say you are going to spank, and then not carry it through. You must do whatever you said you would do.

Scripture tells us the *parts* of the body to spank, "*Judgments are prepared for the scoffer, and beatings for the backs of fools*" (Prov 19:29). God has designed an area of the body to receive corporal punishment. The back, the buttocks and the back of the upper legs are a safe place for a beating since there are no vital body parts that may accidentally be injured in the process, and the latter two parts are preferable since they are farther from the head and have more natural "padding" (and are less likely to be visible to anyone else in case the "stripes" remain a while).

How hard and how long do you spank? Some of it depends on the sin/crime. The idea of corporal punishment is to inflict enough pain to break the will without doing serious injury. In the KJV translation of Proverbs 19:29 it recommends "*stripes for the back of fools.*" This suggests that a proper beating will be forceful enough to leave marks: red lines or even possibly welts (which will disappear shortly). A spanking is supposed to hurt! Mere tapping with the rod,

or spanking through layers of clothing and nappies will not be effective. It is the pain that works brokenness. That is why bare skin is the best place for spanking. A father may need to teach his wife how to use the rod (although in some cases the opposite may be required) in his absence. Most women are by nature more gentle and find it hard to apply sufficient pain in spanking to achieve the intended result. But without pain a spanking is a waste of time and will only serve to frustrate both parent and child.

Your aim should be to spank until you elicit a cry of repentance from the child. Some children will begin crying before the rod makes contact with their backsides, but it is not mere tears that you are after. God said, "... *and let not thy soul spare for his crying.*" (Prov 19:18). God knew that children would try to get around parents by crying before they were hit - take no notice of that crying. Other children will respond to the blows with the rod by crying out in anger and protest, but this is definitely not what you are after. This response must be distinguished from that cry that signals the child is yielding his will and succumbing to the pain. Perhaps this sounds cruel and callous, but what do you think is the point of spanking? If it is not a token gesture, a symbolic event, then we must press on with the infliction of real pain, despite our sensibilities. The pain is what God uses to break the will and produce a submissive spirit. Call it tough love. Just remember you are fighting for the soul of your child, and the Lord expects you to persist until you win the battle for his (her) life. God will hold

you responsible if you don't restrain your child's behaviour and train him (her) to yield to authority. The rod is your tool to that end.

Once the discipline is inflicted, you are not finished. It is time for the all-important *follow-up time*. Now is a very important moment in your relationship with your child. Don't allow him to run off crying, or to run off at all. There are several things you should aim to do at this time, once his/her crying has subsided.

1) Seek a *confession* of sin from the child (if it was not made before the spanking) and have him (her) ask for forgiveness. This casts the whole event in its proper light and keeps the focus on the godly motive for discipline.

2) Express *forgiveness* and love for the child. Comfort him and hold him close. Remember that you disciplined him because you love him, not because you hate him (her) (Heb 12:6). You should assure him (her) verbally of your love.

3) *Pray* for the child. Ask the Lord to forgive him and to work obedience in his heart. It would be good if the child were able and willing to pray, but this is not necessary. The parent can intercede on his (her) behalf at this time.

4) Plan *restitution*. The Bible makes it clear that when a wrong is done to another person the offender ought to pay back the person wronged (e.g. Exod 22:5). If there was someone hurt by his (her) actions a child ought to be required to ask forgiveness of that person. If property was damaged, it ought to be replaced, with more beside. If the injury was intangible, perhaps a hurtful word, the child could be required to perform some acts of service on behalf of the offended. Parents should be creative to consider if there is some way to make restitution. This teaches a valuable lesson about the cost of sin. When all

Now Available:

**FERRAR FENTON TRANSLATION
of the Bible in Modern English
in soft-cover black leather**

This beautiful leather Bible with gold edging now available as #537 @ \$63.00 or if you prefer, the hardcover is available as #531 @ 49.95

Remember that Ferrar Fenton has rearranged the order of books, which causes some people problems finding passages



this is done, it is time to dismiss the child, perhaps with a final hug.

NEVER TOO YOUNG, OR OLD

One final question that may arise: For what age child is discipline with the rod appropriate? The simple answer is, At whatever age he (she) evidences foolish (rebellious) behaviour. There is no age too young nor too old. Now practically, when a child is very young it may be hard to discern when a certain behaviour is a lack of submission. Nor does it seem appropriate to take a nine-month-old across your lap and wale away on his naked legs with a rod. On the other hand, there are times when it is clear that the infant is not getting what he (she) wants, and so screams in protest. This is a form of revolt that should be nipped in the proverbial bud. A moderate stroke or two on the legs with a firm, "No," seems proportional to the offense. Those who wait until a child is two or three to start spanking are definitely waiting too long! The child's will evidences itself well before that and ought to be dealt with at its earliest manifestations. The word "promptly" in Proverbs 13:24 may best be translated "early," which would give this rendering: "*He who spares his rod hates his son, but he who loves him disciplines him early.*" It's never too early for loving chastisement.

Nor is it ever too late. There is nothing in the Bible to suggest that once a child grows to a certain age or size he (she) is immune to this form of punishment. Proverbs makes no such distinctions. The fool of any age deserves stripes on his back for his wilful disobedience (19:29). This might even be an appropriate form of discipline for the civil government to use against fools who disturb the peace and order of the community. But certainly it is always appropriate within the family. Of course there is a serious problem if a 16 -18 year old does something that marks him a fool, thus calling for the rod. If the punishment has been used consistently through the years, it is hard to imagine it would still be necessary at that age. If it has not been consistently used, it may not be effective once the child is that old - it which case it becomes the duty of the parents to hand him(her) over to the state for punishment. We are reminded of Eli's sons with whom we began this study. They needed restraint, but how do you restrain someone who is grown and who still has foolishness bound up in his heart? (see Deut 21:20-21!) Once again we come to the conclusion that it is absolutely vital to begin the process early (you can start from birth!) and thus avoid the prospect of trying to tame the will of an almost-grown child.

THE COST OF PARENTING

It is evident that using the rod has a considerable cost attached to it. To do it right requires the parent to stop what he is doing and take a few minutes out to deal with the sin of his child. Frankly, there are times when any father would rather let an offense go than to go through all this process. Or he would like to just give a few quick strokes with the rod and be done with it. But any shortcuts in the process risks losing the benefits God intends the rod to bring.

I have heard parents say that they would spend their whole day spanking their child if they were to respond to every instance which called for that response. This is an indication that the child has already won the battle for control: he is not submitting to parental authority, but the parents have given up trying to control him (her). It probably also indicates that the parents do not know how to apply the rod properly. The father in this case must commit himself to begin immediately gaining control of his son or daughter. If he uses the rod in the way we have described he will get results. It may be tough for a while as the child tries to see if Dad is serious about being in charge, but eventually he will yield if the discipline is carried out correctly - i.e. with suffi-

cient pain.

Using the rod is not just about developing the character of the child. It is also about the character and faithfulness of the parents. It takes faith, courage, determination, and wisdom to use the rod effectively in the training process. The process we have described here does not come naturally to any parent. We have to be convinced that it is a matter of obedience to employ this method of child training. But as we act in faith and obedience ourselves, we will find that God is faithful to use the means He has ordained to shape our children into God-fearing adults who are motivated to submit to the Lord out of love.

In all of our efforts to train our children we must remember the utter futility of our labours apart from God's blessing. There is no mechanical connection between a spanking and a change in the child. We must bathe all of our efforts in prayer, recognizing that unless the Lord changes the heart of the child, our labour is in vain. But thanks be to God, He is indeed faithful to use the rod as a means of grace as we apply it faithfully, and with faith in our heavenly Father's gracious activity in the hearts of our children.*

Courtesy Patriarch, PO Box 50, Willis, VA 24380

Chuck Kuhler, author of the article THE BIBLE - WHOSE BOOK IS IT? (July 2003, #208, p11) writes:

Striking A Raw Nerve in Religion

In the June 2003 edition of this (his) newsletter, I wrote an article entitles, "*The Bible - Whose Book Is It?*" In summary, the article pointed out that the Bible was not written by, for, or to all peoples of the world. It was written by, for, and to Israel, those people chosen by the Almighty as His elect.

Most of the critical comments received were from clergy in various Judeo-Christian denominational churches who had been given a copy of the newsletter by some unnamed persons. What was most amazing is that these clergy, and others, criticized my contentions and words, *without refuting what I had said*. Is it that the contents of the article cannot be refuted without disregarding the words of the Bible? It is indeed a sad commentary when the "church," claiming some 65 million born-again Christians, is of no effect against corruption and evil in this day, and is in fact so concerned with materialistic gain as to be a major part of the evil. Why is it that so many of the clergy really do not look forward to the return of Jesus Christ? Could the words of the Almighty as found in Jeremiah 23 and Ezekiel 34 be causing concern for these false shepherds? The time is coming when they will have to answer for their "works."

Courtesy Virginia Christian Israelite, Box 109, Round Hill VA 20142

Another month gone, and the camp getting closer and closer. Please check your calendars - Dec 26 to Jan 2, and start making your preparations for coming to this great camp. God willing we will have Pastor Don Elmore, from the Fellowship of God's Covenant People in Kentucky as our guest speaker, and hopefully we will have Arnold Kennedy as well. However, to make this worthwhile, we do need your support, both in your attendance and in your helping with the air fares - so please, make every effort to be a part of this great get-together at the end of this year. We look forward to seeing new faces, and renewing past friendships.

Thank you for past support and for your letters and orders and newspaper clippings. Sorry if some mail has been a bit slow. My daughter has been busy with piano exams, but that is now behind us. God bless your faithfulness, and keep you in His gracious care,

