



Christian Identity Ministries

PO Box 146, CARDWELL QLD 4849, Australia

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

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

#212

Newsletter

November AD2003

PETS AS CHILDREN AND HUELINGS TO RESTOCK THE LAND

From our European Desk By Adam de Witt

In many European lands, the average family has less than 1.5 children. If we are to take the statistics for white families, I think you will find that the average pans out far worse.

This 1.5 average is pretty poor. It is all the poorer when one understands that the statistic is bolstered by the huelings (non-whites) who are the mainstay of the ones bearing most of the children here. To reach an overall 1.5, it means whites must be having far less than that!

ANTI-SAXON SURROUNDINGS....

Out and away from the big towns one can feel one is in Europe where most dwellers are white, more than 80-90% if not more. But any town over 30,000 and the scales begin to tilt the other way. The Dutch towns are very charmingly Israelite, where many fine old buildings of Saxon design date back many hundreds of years. In such towns they still fill many a streetscape. Yet towns like Rotterdam are an utter nightmare. There Saxon culture is all but gone. The buildings reflect all the anti-ideals of the Jewish Bauhaus bewaying (movement) which began in the 1920's. The "tares began to rise above the "wheat" in the late 1800's and in the 20th year-hundred they began to swallow us up altogether.

Bauhaus was a design bewaying (movement) which started in poor old Germany by a bunch of Canaanites whose aim it was to replace Saxon design-work with their Talmudic simplistic, no-frills designs. Before then, Saxons loved to shape things that were as handy as they were comely. From the time Saxons came into Europe until the Bauhaus clique came along, all things were designed to be shaped with patterns and shapes found in the natural world shaped by God. It was a Saxon's first-nature to shape things the way God would, with great comeliness. Comeliness was deemed to be as practical as practicality itself. Why? Because if something looked as lovely as it was practical, then it was all the more practical as it made the world more pleasing to behold. A more pleasing world to behold makes for a more uplifted Saxon folk, thus frills are life-giving, they are not a waste of time. Saxons understood that God's creation would be the best role model in which to seek inspiration for design patterns to dress things up with. And so the leaves of countless plants laid the groundwork for design-frills which enliven everything from the columns of Egyptian temples (True Egyptians, long died out, were Saxon kinsfolk) to the baroque swirls which dress up the fine 16th year-hundreds homes of Amsterdam. Bauhaus was to put an end to this.

Every modern building design since the 1920's, unless it was a period revival style, was based on Bauhaus anti-design, and unwittingly copied by nearly everyone brought up in that time since the 1920's. Rotterdam is a Bauhaus 'anti-heaven.'

Together with this Canaanite nightmare comes the Canaanite mindset as part and parcel.

SPIRITUAL CANAANITES

Churches brewed up the tripe saying, "Spiritual Israelites." The truth is that there is NO such thing; instead, we find true Israelites who are **spiritual Canaanites**. My folk love it so. In this world of anti-culture, huelings find a snug dung heap to shift into from their lands where they ethnically cleansed whites from during the bloody bouts of "decolonization." Now they are 'de-whiting' white lands as well. But should that stop whites from having white children? Yet they do stop having them. (It is a curse from God, who said "you will be left few in number," but isn't it interesting how people really do bring this curse upon themselves?)

In the Bauhaus 'Edomite-dukedom,' called Rotterdam, I see quite a few white mothers. I almost helped them a number of times, thinking, "let me help my Saxon kinsfolk," as they struggle to get on or off the local underground trains with their strollers and 'kinder-wagons' (prams). Leaning over to see what I hoped would be a Saxon wunderkind, I was too often loathed to see a *mamzer*, a mixing! Yes, the silly Saxon 'cow' had ploughed with a beast of the field. "Well, help yourself," I at once think. She had grown up as a spiritual Canaanite.

TO WHOM DO SOME SAXON WOMEN YIELD?

The white birth-rate must be far lower than 1.5. Looking around, it must be as low as 0.5. The huelings are having heaps of their kind filling Saxon lands. Whilst

IN THIS ISSUE:

Pets as Children, Adam de Witt	1
Royal Snare, Adam de Witt	3
Removing God from the Law,	3
Christians and Tolerance,	4
Old Testament Baptism,	5
A Lesson in Good Donkey Behaviour,	11
Answering Service,	13
Oh, What A World!,	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!

any white girls who **do yield** their bodies to a male seed, tend to do so to those **not** of their kind. Instead they open their wombs to the unclean seed of the beasts of the field (Ezra 9:2).

It is a sad irony that white women on the whole don't mind white men idolizing them as some kind of goddess, but it is a rare white woman who looks up to the white man as 'lord.' (1 Pet 3:6). A white woman who does so is frowned upon by other white women as a doormat.

The irony is worsened by another froward sickness. So many white women want their white men to be 'sweet,' thus having him 'unmanned.' (or neutered). Yet this is not so when it comes to black males. Then white women behave overly yielding as if he is a wonder prize and looks up to the black male as 'Lord.' I see it all the time here on the streets of the bigger towns. The white women who go out with blacks tend to be very feminine, submissive, very feely, touching and petting, drooling or walking several paces behind 'it.' And the more brutish 'it' looks, the prettier the girl and the more yielding she be. Yet they'd never do this for men who are bone of their bone and flesh of their flesh. Furthermore, they have many more offspring of these huelings than they do with white men, that is, if they haven't yet sealed up their wombs to white men through contraception and sterilization.

What on earth makes them so foolish? I asked several people this. Guess what the answer is time and again? The answer is always the same pitiful one. And it is grounded in Canaanite, 'anti-white male' propaganda, namely, that it has to do with a Negroes genitals! I was not born yesterday, and I have seen plenty of natural timespell (history) and folkdelving (anthropological photos of negroes in their natural state, and their genitalia is often quite the opposite of the tripe propaganda that the 'silly women' and dumbfounded, non-thinking men of our kind fall for. Firstly, it is a pitiful thing to swoon and to yield simply over genitalia and to offer ones womb for it; secondly, the Negroes' genitals are nothing special, his love-making is selfish and his seed is unclean and will NOT give offspring that are of your kind. White women fall for Jewish fables whilst overlooking Godly truths. Who is it that gave white women electricity to give the comforts of life; who is it that invented the comforts of home; who invented true housing, coolers, cars, aircraft, books, washing machines, radios and everything from a doornail to a space-shuttle? Who? White MEN! Is God asking too much of white women when he BEHESTS them to revere their husbands? It is only the white MEN of all the species on the earth to whom God has given such skills. Yet the white male is belittled time and again, and white women love the ways of blacks more. In Titus we read that those of the cutting (circumcision) trick whole households, especially, the 'silly women.' We are a superior race of fools!

In a TV advert here in Holland, a white boy who of course looks like a loser and a twit, goes into a nightclub. He sees two white girls having fun dancing. Of course they are shown as prizes to grovel for. He drools, they don't even see him. (Once women drooled over white men, knowing how life-some (vital) they are to their yondertime (future). He grabs a certain make of fizzy drink and out pops a pint-sized negro who of course is 'cool.' He starts to jigger-boo on the boy's shoulder and naturally now he can dance and now he catches the girls' eyes. Thus a white boy is only of any good to a white girl when coached by a negro

No one does anything, dumb white males see it and

laugh. Dumb white girls see it and believe it. White men, stand up, the calling is yours alone to make a difference, even if the women of our kind think our work is irrelevant. We need to learn more truth and to work together on this. The yonder-time (future) of our folk, our children and our world rest not with Greenies, Feminists, Socialists, and other Jewish-backed and bank-rolled cliques, but the unseen, unappreciated yet called-out Saxon males of God.

If Abraham was to walk the streets of our lands, would he find any righteous whereby he could plead to God to spare our lands, as he did for the towns of the plains - Sodom and Gomorrah?

YOU REAP THE PLAGUES OF EGYPT

Of the white women who do not whore their "bellies of lilies" to the thorns, many do not yield their "bellies" up at all. They have sealed their wombs and sealed their lot and the lot of our folk. Indeed the plagues of Egypt are upon them. For not only are vaccinations the bedrock of cancer, the seeds of cancer these sow, lay wait in the parts of the body with weaker tendencies, often parts unused. Research has shown greater numbers of incidents of cancer-of-the-breast and of the womb in women not having children (it has been stated that the contraceptive pill could be a major contributor). Furthermore, the more children a woman bears, the lesser the chance of getting these deadly illnesses. Little wonder that the Bible states that women are saved in childbearing. Yet white women would rather have pets and dumb white men are more than happy for that.

ONE TIME OFFER-ONE SET ONLY

You must phone your request for:

"OUR GREAT SEAL"

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.....

WE'D RATHER HAVE PETS

Yes, pets, because here, and I am sure it's the same in other Saxon lands, I see more white men and white women walking their dogs than walking with kinderwagons holding white babies. And then, to ease their consciences, they donate money and sponsor black children in Africa - and say they have no money for any of their own!

At this point, I can almost hear many scry that I am anti-pet. I am not against having pets, but there is a big rift between having a guard dog and a pampered, over-loved, over-fed dog instead of children. In Holland there are so many dogs and so few white children. Whereas in the big towns there are plenty of babies - but few are white!

A BEFOLKING ON THE WAY OUT

In the big towns for every white I see 8 non-whites. Suid Afrika was once a white land, did you know that? No, I don't mean simply white-run, I mean WHITE. Blacks were once a minority group. Yet, not only did the blacks start pouring in, they were breeding and whites were having pets. In Suid Afrika, for every white child born, 5 blacks were born and cared for by white taxpayers, so lowering their infant-mortality-rate as well. Still women carried on saying, "my body is my own," despite God saying it is His, and of the husband of YOUR race He made for you. God however will not be mocked, not even by white women.

In Suid Afrika, white women are learning that their bodies are not their own when raped and slain by a hueling, a sad reality check. The male beast of the field says to itself, "dumb whitey bitch," (I am sorry if you do not like that word, but that is what black males call females, it's the truth - and, you hear much worse words on TV), "get



real, your body is mine to do as I darn well feel, so take that,” says the rapist. It is not about sex, let alone love. It is about humiliation and the wrecking of the slaying (victim). It is raw, it is brutish, it is beastly ... but it is real. Try and tell ‘it,’ the hueling rapist that your body is your own. (as seen in NSW have found out - with those not of their kind)

THE GREATEST CALLING, BLESS THE EARTH WITH OUR KIND

I see women and men here in Holland taking their dogs for endless walks, getting up early to do so. I see them getting the best food for these beasties, grooming them, cuddling them, training them, hanging photos on their walls of them, taking out health coverage for them, fussing over them, talking about their achievements and do you recall when Spotty did this and that, even worrying over burial whilst not a baby graces the home. all the things they think is too much ado for children, nay, they even fuss more over their pets than one would over children, and they would be the first to say that pets are less of a handful than children.

Nowhere does the Bible say, “suffer the doggies and cats.” It says, **Suffer the little children for THEIRS is the kingdom.** Nor does it say withhold your seed so that other races can restock the earth.

If you can’t drive out the heathen, the least you can do is breed the little SAXON children to restock the earth and to lavish on them what folks here do on their doggies. Children are not your weakness, they are your strength. Ask any hueling if children are their downfall, it is not for nothing that they are restocking the earth.**

ROYAL SNARE

by Adam de Witt

“If thy hand be stricken with a non-Saxon, thou art snared.” Thus goes the meaning of a Bible verse (Prov 6:1-2)

So many Saxons still think that the royals are above the Law of God and can do no wrong, but ‘Race-besnaring,’ or racial-treason, is besnaring or treason, no matter who does the deed. God is not a respecter of persons. That is to say, He does not see rank as a right to over-ride His Law; indeed, the higher ones rank the more He demands of higher rankers. To whom more is given, more is awaited (expected).

So what are we making of Nelson Mandela’s birthday party in July 2003. Mandela is the terrorist who worked to kill my kinsfolk, to kill the folk of the holy seed, and bank-rolled by those who hate us. Yet the Dutch queen, one of her sons, and his Argentinian wife went to the birthday party of a brute beast who speaks like a dove. Ah, I hear some say, she had to go. Would she have gone to Hitler’s birthday, had he been alive?

I am sure a diplomatic cock and bull tale would have been made up. But let us give her the benefit of the doubt. Did she have to “get on down” on the dance floor and lovingly do the Jigger-boo for the world to see as so clearly broadcast on Dutch TV? Yes, she was swinging to the heathen beat and loving it. Where does her heart belong? Yes, we all sin. The poor of my kind often need to sin to get by, that is how low our race of kings has fallen. But to those of higher rank, they do not need to stoop low to earn a crust and if they do, they do not need to love it so. They can dip-

tomatically refuse; a luxury not set-aside for those ‘kings and priests’ the ‘royals’ call, “common.” Call no man (White man) unclean (common), all whites are sinners and all whites are kings and priests!***

REMOVING GOD FROM THE LAW = LOSS OF LIBERTY

Scott Williams writes of his experience in facing political systems in Europe. We met Scott in Coffs Harbour a couple of years ago where he is the pastor of a church, **Salt Shakers.**

We are a Christian church presently based in fourteen countries throughout the world and have experienced how the European Union (EU) is destroying the Biblical basis of many formerly Christian nations. We stand for the Bible and seek to live out the instructions that God has given us in His Word. Because of this stance, the humanistic, atheistic law-enforcers of the European Union have seen fit to attack the very foundation of the Christian church - the family unit.

In Germany and Sweden for example, the European authorities threatened to remove children out of Christian homes for the “heinous” crime of bringing them up according to God’s pattern as found in the book of Proverbs!

The German government also wanted to deport one of our Pastors because he dared preach the entire Word of God, which apparently is not well received anymore in Europe. In Britain, one church member is facing possible charges because he smacked an unruly child. But even this seems to contravene some European law or other human rights! Have “human rights” replaced the Good

New Video

Believing is Seeing! Lorraine Day, M.D.

The popular accepted concept is that Seeing - is Believing! “I’ll believe it when I see it!” But when it comes to getting well, that’s backwards. Learning to trust God and believe His healing promises when the outlook appears hopeless requires faith that only God can give. When we finally believe - then we will see!

*Learn how you can know more and become wiser than the medical “experts.” *Understand why ALL action is dependent on belief.

*Learn how you can find the courage, strength and faith to persevere when everything looks hopeless. See astonishing spontaneous testimonials from people who have recovered, or are recovering, from many diseases including colon cancer, breast cancer, uterine fibroid tumors, infertility, and polycythemia vera, a cancer-like blood disease. 115 minutes.

#CI-354 LOAN ONLY, sug don \$6

Book as the rule of Law?

In France, freedom of religion has already been legislated against, with the Anti-Sect law passed in 2002. This law is written in vague terms and does not even define a sect. It bans “sects from advertising, and prohibits them from opening missions or soliciting members near schools, hospitals or retirement homes.”² The possible punishment that the Baptist church and other evangelical groups have all been threatened with, includes fines of up to \$75,000 or up to five years in prison.

Alain Vivien, chairman of a French ministerial mission to combat the influence of cults, claims that France is not alone in their development of anti-sect laws and Germany and Belgium are strong supporters of this move.³

Countries such as Britain, Sweden and Denmark all had systems of law that were modelled on God’s Law, and viewed it as the highest authority. The citizens of these countries once enjoyed unparalleled liberty, which they now stand in jeopardy of losing as their Bible-based constitutions are eroded by the humanistic influence of the European Union.

British law is based upon English Common Law and the *Magna Carta*. The influence of the Bible on the development of law can clearly be seen in Britain. Unlike the British system, much of Europe is ruled by a humanistic system of civil law.

Civil law involves different schools of interpretation.



“By the different principles of interpretation ... former decisions may be disregarded, [and] much certainty in the law is lost...”⁴

As the law is not the standard whereby judgments are made, the governing authority’s interpretation becomes the law. Since there is no appeal to the higher authority of God’s Word, this system easily leads to despotism and tyranny. Civil law is more concerned with finding which law can best be applied in the situation in question.

In contrast, Britain has a remarkably leaner law system as they do not regulate all details, but focus instead on maintaining justice. To mention just one example - the EU’s directive on duck eggs contains 26,911 words; the Ten Commandments required 297!¹

As it is only God’s authority that protects the liberties of the people of Britain, it stands to reason that these liberties are in grave danger as Britain yields to the leadership of the EU. The EU has no concern for God’s authority and has completely avoided mention of God in the recent constitution preamble.

DEUTERONOMY 28:15 says, “...if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the LORD thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee.”

One of the central principles ensuring justice is that people are equal before the law. In defiance of this, the Treaty of Amsterdam granted Europol, the EU’s police force, the power to act outside the law. Europol officers are “immune from legal process of any kind for acts performed ... in the exercise of their official functions.”

Britain and other formerly Christian nations need to WAKE-UP!!

1. Mote, Ashley. “Vigilance: A Defense of British Liberty” Petersfield: Tanner Publishing, 2001.
2. “Proposed France Anti-Cult Law Raises Ire of U.S. Religious Groups” New York Times, Thurs. Jan 25, 2001.
3. Webster, Paul. “France to Crack Down on Sects” The Guardian, June 14, 2000.
4. A Treatise on the principles of pleading in civil actions. Henry John Stephen. pub. 1871.

Scott Williams is a pastor with Christian Assemblies International, Coffs Harbour, NSW. (www.cai.org - info@cai.org.au).

CHRISTIANS & TOLERANCE

by Warwick Murphy

Definition: Tolerance: *adjective*, tolerating things, especially other peoples behaviour, beliefs, etc. *The Australian Oxford Study Dictionary*.

I have thought about this topic for some time. However the recent decision of The Uniting Church to allow homosexuals to be ordained, and the similar problems faced by the Anglican Church have prompted me to finally put finger to keyboard.

We hear the call on a regular basis these days, “If you are really a Christian you should be tolerant and loving.”

Well, I have had enough!! I have watched Christians of all denominations cower at this call. I have seen them melt away as the onslaught continues. This seemingly natural correlation between tolerance and being loving causes so many to question their attitudes. Now whole denominations

are telling us that tolerance demands that they accept things that should be totally out of the question. Can someone please direct me to the text in the scriptures that informs me that tolerance is the holy grail of my life? Where does it say that tolerance should be sought after like gold? Which prophet thunders that we should bow the knee before the prophets of tolerance?

As I read my Bible I find that God Himself is **NOT tolerant**, neither was Jesus tolerant when He walked this earth. I find the prophets were not tolerant, and I find that the epistles urge me not to be tolerant either.

I confess **I AM NOT TOLERANT**, and I have no desire to be that way. I will not be tolerant of those who make a mockery of the scripture by selfishly indulging their emotions, whether that is to practice homosexuality, sexually abuse children, have an affair with a neighbour’s wife or cheat on their friends. I will NOT be tolerant of so-called church leaders who abdicate their God-given responsibility to appease those with the loudest voice. I will NOT be tolerant of politicians who persist in giving mealy-mouthed responses to genuine community concerns.

There are many, many things about which I am not tolerant, and if you are honest neither are you. Interestingly enough we can also see that those who advocate tolerance are just as intolerant of those who disagree with them. Have you ever heard Jon Faine, an ABC journalist in Victoria, when confronted with someone who has a different opinion to him on refugees or drugs, or

homosexuality? The contempt in his voice is obvious. Some of those who advocate tolerance are in fact some of the most intolerant people in the community. The fact is that they are actually trying to do something else. They are manipulating us. They couch their manipulation in other words but the reality is that they are manipulating us with the aim that their point of view becomes the dominant story.

It is time to STOP this one-sided game. Listening to the comments of some at the Uniting Church conference highlighted how tolerance can lead us away from the truth. One delegate said that she did not want to be a part of a church that could not show tolerance to others. Another said that she was proud that her church had chosen the path of tolerance. They seemed to miss the point that tolerance is not the main game, the validity of the Scriptures should have been their concern. It seemed that tolerance had taken a more important place. And that is the danger. That we denigrate and compromise the truth of God’s Word to appease those with a lesser commitment to the truth than God calls for.

Tolerance and love are not interchangeable words. They have very different meanings and we are in real danger of error if we think otherwise. Love confronts. If my children are doing the wrong thing then it is my duty as a parent to confront that behaviour, not tolerate it. We should not be made to feel guilty because people think we are not tolerant. maybe it is time to revel in the fact that we are not tolerant. Maybe if more people were not so tolerant we would have a different society!

Tolerance has led us to accept small groups with loud voices being able to close down major roadways in Melbourne in recent days. Tolerance has led us to give serious

Tapes of the Month

W-031 (a) **Tolerance & Indifference**, and
(b) **Gurus, Priests and Signseekers**,

by Ben Williams.

AC-2111 **The Bible vs Tolerance**, pt 1 and
AC-2112 **The Bible vs Tolerance**, pt 2 both by
late Pastor Earl Jones.

We hear much today that Christians should tolerate this, that and the other. These things are usually said by people who will not tolerate Christians! Listen to these!

This month, sug don \$12 the 3 tapes!



consideration to legalizing Cannabis and heroin-injecting rooms. Tolerance has driven the push for 'Sex Tolerance Zones' in Melbourne. Tolerance led the USA, through the embarrassment of Bill Clinton's behaviour, because we heard the argument that a politician's private life is not up for comment. Tolerance has led to the bizarre spectacle of the Mardi Gras in Sydney, even though this expression of sexual behaviour has major health hazards associated with it. Tolerance has presented the Victorian Police Force with the dilemma of what to do with the application by a transsexual person to join the force.

To highlight the hypocrisy of this mantra of tolerance, while so many are advocating that we should be a tolerant society, we are not tolerant of cigarette smokers. We are not tolerant of those who drive over the speed limit, forget to buckle their seat belts, or ride a bike without a helmet (the zero tolerance policy?). The strongest advocates of tolerance are certainly not too tolerant of anyone associated with the church making a public stand for righteousness.

Tolerance has also affected us as Christians in other ways. It would seem to me that we believe that we have to be tolerant of mediocrity in the performance of others because we don't think that we can confront it. We have become too nice for our own good. Being nice is not always being loving. Loving someone means that I care enough to tell them the truth, and sometimes that can be difficult. I have been involved with a number of groups trying to organize certain things and found my frustration growing at the lack of ability to make decisions because we might offend another member of the group. In the end the group either continues to achieve very little, or people just leave because it is going nowhere. Why can't we be honest and state the truth that in some cases people are trying to do a job that they are not equipped for. They may be very nice and well-meaning people, but they may also be the wrong person for that particular job. Many Christians would not run their business the way they try to run their church. In business they try to put the right people, that is the people best equipped to do a job, in the right position. They are able to confront mediocrity in the workplace but struggle to do the same in a Christian setting.

Is this because we are trying to be tolerant and loving? Being a Christian does not necessarily mean being 'nice.' God has given us all different gifts and abilities. Some have leadership gifts, others don't. Some can organize things, others can't. God has seen fit to give me some ability in pastoral care, hence I work as a counsellor, but there are many of my friends who are far better off staying away from trying to counsel anyone, for their own benefit, as well as the benefit of others.

We seem to forget that church history shows us a litany of intolerance. Jesus was intolerant of the money changers in the temple. The apostles were intolerant of the hypocrisy of Ananias and Saphira (and God was also intolerant of them). Martin Luther was intolerant of the beliefs of his church. William Booth was intolerant of poverty and unscrupulous business practices of his day. We could go on ..

Christianity is *not* about tolerance, it is about following God's will. Next time you hear someone tell you that Christians are supposed to be tolerant; it will probably be from a person who is not a Christian and knows very little about

what Christianity is really all about.

Romans 12 may help us to clarify things: "*Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind.*"

Courtesy Salt Shakers, (www.saltshakers.org.au)

continuing our series on Baptism from August:

OLD TESTAMENT BAPTISM

by Stephen E. Jones

In dealing with the two works of Christ, we have come face to face with two of the most basic things that affect us all: Death and Life. The first goat died; the second lived. When Jesus fulfilled these laws on the Day of Atonement, shortly after His 30th birthday, He presented Himself to John for **Baptism**. The idea behind baptism is likewise Death and Life.

Many Levels of Baptism

Overall, God's plan and purpose for creation itself manifests the underlying principle of baptism; that is, Death and Life. By the law of the two witnesses, He has subdivided all things in twos.

Level 1

The first subdivision of creation was when God created the heavens and the earth (Gen 1:10). The heavens represent the spiritual realm, which is the source of life. The earth represents the physical realm, which characterized the realm of death.

In other words, on this most basic level, God instituted the principle of baptism. We are born into the Adamic realm of death, in order that we might then be reborn into the realm of Life through the "second Adam," who is Jesus. Thus, creation itself is experiencing a Great Baptism. The purpose of death is life. God is baptizing creation. He "locked up" all in unbelief, that He might have mercy upon all (in the context of Scripture,

CIM). He baptized all into death, that He might also raise them up in newness of life.

Level 2

We may further subdivide the earthly realm of death in two. Let us call it the Old and New Testament time. Jesus death and resurrection cut history into two parts. The Old Testament's focus was on death, pictured by Passover; the New Testament's focus is on life, pictured by the Wave-sheaf offering. These two feasts together depict the baptism of history on level 2.

Level 3

We may subdivide the O.T. realm of death in two as well. Call it the Law and the Prophets. The Law kills, because all have sinned, and the Law cannot acquit the guilty. The prophets, on the other hand, deal with the realm of the Spirit, and thus focus on Life, even though they are under the general category of the O.T. of Level 2, and the earthly, Adamic realm of Level 1.

The Law and prophets find their focus in Moses and Elijah. Moses died and could not enter the Promised Land, while "Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven" (2 Kings 2:11)

Level 4

We may further subdivide Moses (and the Law) into two parts: Moses and Joshua. Moses died in the wilderness, while Joshua lived to cross the Jordan into the Prom-



ised Land. Their ministries are divided by the Jordan River, which again pictures baptism. The Jordan divides that portion of history into two realms: dying in the wilderness, and living into the Promised Land.

Level 5

This is the individual level. Moses instituted the law of baptisms, as primarily depicted in the law of the two doves. That law was designed to cleanse the leper, to bring the individual out of death into the realm of life. It resolves on the individual, personal level the problem that goes back to the first and highest level of baptism. It resolves the problem of death in the Adamic creation, the earth. It pictures our coming out of death into life.

Understanding All Levels

Some people focus upon corporate fulfillments of the great Plan of God. Others focus upon the personal and individual level. Few people are able to grasp God's workings on all levels. Yet this is crucial to our understanding of the mind of God. Each level is another verification of the basic principles of death and life, of baptism.

God's plan includes both death and life. It is His purpose that we experience both. This is not arguable. God did it out of the counsel of His own will. While Joshua operated under the Life principle on level 4, he could not break past the death principle on levels 1-3. Those levels were out of his hands, determined by a higher plan. Joshua did not choose to be born in the earth, or in the O.T. period. That was predetermined in the mind of God at the beginning.

We ourselves live under Life in level 2, the N.T. period. But we too operate under the Death of the Adamic world on level 1. Thus, while we do have greater opportunity for Life on level 2, it is still subordinate to the Death of level 1. And so people still get sick, get old, and die, no matter how spiritual they are on levels 2-5.

These levels have been established by God from the beginning. They operate under the general principle of Baptism (Death/Life). They are governed by Time, and they end only at the appointed times. Those appointed times are manifested by the feast days of Israel.

The Doctrine of Baptisms

The book of Hebrews deals with various aspects of the Levitical priesthood, showing how it has changed into a better priesthood with spiritual ordinances. In that context, Hebrews 6:2 speaks of "the doctrine of baptisms" and 9:10 speaks of "divers washings" (*Gr. baptisimos*) as though the readers were already well acquainted with the subject.

Unfortunately, today's Christian readers know little of ancient Hebrew culture and generally know almost nothing of the "baptisms" that the author of Hebrews spoke of. Most Christians know only of the N.T. "one Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Eph 4:5). They know nothing of "baptisms."

The doctrine of baptisms actually goes back into the law of Moses. John the Baptist did NOT invent baptism. He did no new thing. Being a priest of the line of Aaron through Zacharias, his father, John learned all about baptisms as an apprentice of the Temple. A priest of Aaron began his Temple service at the age of 25 and retired at 50 (Num. 8:24), but his ministry was quite limited for the first 5 years.

Numbers 4:3, 23, 30, 35, 39 tell us that they had to be thirty years old to "perform the service" (Heb. "war the warfare") in the tabernacle or temple. Thus, John the Baptist was

an apprentice from the age of 25 to the age of 30. At the age of 30 he began preaching in the wilderness, baptizing people, not in the temple, but wherever water could be found. This was his real service to God. He apparently found that he was unable to serve God fully under the organized religion at Herod's temple, so he served the spiritual temple in heaven. Thus, his ministry was not tied to a physical temple.

The key point to see is that John learned of baptisms from the law of Moses. Thus, for us to understand Hebrews 6:2 and 9:10, we too must go back to the O.T. and study the law of baptisms.

The Baptism of Naaman, the Leper

In previous issues (of FFI) we dealt with the law of the 2 doves and the 2 goats. The first dove and the first goat were killed, the second ones were left alive. We showed how the first dove was "killed in an earthen vessel over running water" (Lev. 14:5) on behalf of the leper at the time of his cleansing. More than this, we read in 14:7,

"And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean"

This is one of the "divers washings" (baptisms) that Heb. 9:10 speaks of. When Naaman the Syrian came to Elisha to be healed of his leprosy, Elisha sent word to him that he should wash in the Jordan river 7 times (2 Kings 5:10). Reluctantly, Naaman did so, and he was indeed cleansed of leprosy.

Elisha's word was not a random leading of the Spirit. He simply told Naaman to follow the law of Num. 14:7. Elisha did NOT tell Naaman to

go to the temple for baptism at the hands of the Levitical priest. The priesthood had already become corrupted. So Elisha bypassed the earthly temple and told him to baptize himself at the temple in heaven, whose baptismal font was the waters of the Jordan river.

In other words, Elisha could see beyond the physical temple. Years later, John the baptist understood the same principle and did much of his baptizing at the Jordan, rather than at the laver of Herod's temple.

One might also ask why the lepers had to be baptized (sprinkled) seven times. Why not just once? I believe it is prophetic. It speaks of 7,000 years. Some identify it with 7 dispensations, or ages. However one views it, it is clear that God requires more than one work to complete the cleansing. Naaman was not cleansed until the 7th sprinkling.

Yes, Naaman was sprinkled. He followed the law of lepers here, for Elisha knew the law and was obviously telling Naaman to fulfill the law. But since the KJV says he "*dipped himself seven times*," we need to look at it more closely. In 2 Kings 5:10 we read,

"And Elisha sent a messenger unto him, saying, Go and WASH [Heb. rachats] in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean."

The question is, did Elisha tell Naaman to do as the Law prescribed? or did he tell Naaman to do it differently? In my view, Elisha was abiding by the Law and thus told Naaman to do what Lev. 14:7 prescribed, except that the ceremony was simplified.

The Law said to dip the cedar, scarlet, and hyssop into the blood of the first dove as it was killed in an earthen

New Video:

MASTERS OF TERROR

by Alex Jones

In two hours, Alex Jones reveals the Globalists' master plan for world domination. In this powerful expose Jones explains how the elite are using manufactured terrorism to drive populations into accepting tyranny. The Masters of Terror details the execution of Sept 11th attacks and the ensuing white-wash, cashless society control grid, implanted microchips, mind control, militarization of police, concentration camps, foreign troops massing on US soil, the USA Patriot Act, and Homeland Security.

CI-350 sug don \$20 or \$6 loan



vessel over running water. Then the leper was sprinkled 7 times with the running water (not with the blood).

Naaman's baptism was a simplified version of the law of the leper. It was enough that Naaman had the faith to rachats (wash) in Jordan 7 times. The Jordan river qualified as "running water." The Hebrew text literally reads, "living water," because the prime focus of water baptism is not really death, but to arise in newness of Life.

Naaman felt humiliated and insulted by Elisha's command at first, but his advisors calmed him down and convinced him to do it. (God always makes things easy, but hard on the pride). Thus, we read in verse 14,

"Then went he down and dipped [Heb. tabal] himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God; and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean."

So Elisha told him to rachats; but Naaman would actually *tabal* himself. What is this word *tabal*? Strong's Concordance says it means "to dip."

Young's Concordance, (#536 @ \$55.00) on the other hand, says it means to "moisten or besprinkle." There are obviously different opinions on this.

The Septuagint (LXX - Greek translation of the Hebrew O.T. done in 280 BC) translates *tabal* with the Greek word *baptizo*, from which we get "baptism." Thus, the Septuagint scholars tell us that Naaman was baptized 7 times. The Septuagint translation is important, because it became the standard by which we may know the Greek equivalents to Hebrew concepts.

So what exactly did Naaman do at the Jordan river? The answer is to be found in looking at the Law's ceremony in Lev. 14. There we find that the priest was to dip the cedar, scarlet, and hyssop in the blood of the dove and sprinkle the leper 7 times. **The cedar, scarlet, hyssop, and the 2nd dove were all dipped in blood; but the leper was sprinkled with water.** The whole ceremony is called "baptism." So it really depends on whether one focuses upon the dipping into the blood or upon the sprinkling with the water.

The real question is, who is being baptized here? is it the hyssop or the leper? Where is the focus of Scripture? Is God cleansing the leper? Obviously, the leper is the one in need of "baptism," but he was never required to immerse 7 times in water.

This ceremony was normally done at the laver of the tabernacle or temple, which was outfitted with faucets (taps). If anyone had been immersed in the laver, it would have rendered the water unclean ceremonially. So they just turned on the faucet to provide running water for baptismal purposes.

The Bible does not tell us precisely how Naaman was baptized. The writer of 2 Kings apparently felt it was unnecessary, since the mode of baptism was already clearly spelled out in the law. He may have used a bowl, or he may have just dipped his hand in the water, and sprinkled or poured water on his head. Maybe a servant did this for him. We are not told. The word "himself" in vs 14 is not in the original Hebrew text, so Naaman did not necessarily dip "himself" 7 times. But whatever he did, the Septuagint calls it a "baptism;" and whatever he did, it was to fulfill the law of the leper in Leviticus 14.

When we deal with ceremonial cleansings in the Bible, we must understand that Hebrew culture in the Bible was much different from modern practice in America. We are dealing with pouring or sprinkling. The Hebrews washed their hands before eating a meal, not to remove dirt and

germs, but to ceremonially cleanse their hands. Thus, they did not plunge their hands into a bowl of water, but poured water over their hands into a bowl, as 2 Kings 3:11 says:

"... Here is Elisha the son of Shaphat, which poured water on the hands of Elijah."

The Cleansing of Israel from Leprosy

Ezekiel uses the law of leprosy in speaking of a time when God would cleanse the whole house of Israel as a corporate body. Ezekiel 36:25-27.

"Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in My statutes, and ye shall keep My judgments and do them."

The Law, you recall, says that the priest was to pour the oil on the cleansed leper's head (Lev. 14:18) on the last day of his cleansing. Ezekiel interprets this to show God putting His Spirit within us and giving us a new heart. It is the final step of the leper's cleansing that began with the sprinkling of water 7 times.

Therefore, we can see that this depicts both water baptism and the Holy Spirit baptism. They are two distinct steps, separated by a week, but they are both necessary to eradicate the

death-nature we inherited from Adam.

Both types of baptism were administered by sprinkling or pouring upon the head. Hence, at Pentecost we see the cloven tongues of fire sitting upon their heads (Acts 2:3). The fire did not inundate them. It merely rested upon their heads. That was more than sufficient to fulfill the Law.

The Baptism of Blood

There is a third baptism as well. In Lev. 14 we find that the second dove was dipped, or baptized in the blood of the first. Once again, we must question the act of dipping. The first dove was killed, but to my knowledge, a single dove would not have enough blood to fill a bowl. Certainly, the second dove could never be immersed in the blood of the first dove.

Thus, we must recognize that "dipping" is not necessarily to immerse in the sense that we use the English word. The priest killed the first dove and allowed its blood to drip or squirt into a bowl. The second dove was pushed into the bowl and smeared with blood before being released. This is what it means to "dip". **It was a baptism of blood.**

Another instance of blood baptism is when the Mosaic covenant was established. Exodus 24:8 says,

"And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people and said, Behold, the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words."

In the book of Hebrews we find the N.T. application relative to the New Covenant. Hebrews 12:24 says,

"And to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel."

I believe this is what is meant in Heb. 10:19-22, where we read:

"Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus. Let us draw near with a

CAMP

Last month, you received the camp notice and registration form. If you had ever planned to come to a camp, I suggest you make the arrangements NOW! With all the work and expense that is involved in organizing a camp and speakers, if we do not get sufficient numbers this time, **THIS WILL BE THE LAST CAMP!!** We have tried different times of the year, we have asked people at what times they would be willing to come. This is the result!

death-nature we inherited from Adam.

Both types of baptism were administered by sprinkling or pouring upon the head. Hence, at Pentecost we see the cloven tongues of fire sitting upon their heads (Acts 2:3). The fire did not inundate them. It merely rested upon their heads. That was more than sufficient to fulfill the Law.

The Baptism of Blood

There is a third baptism as well. In Lev. 14 we find that the second dove was dipped, or baptized in the blood of the first. Once again, we must question the act of dipping. The first dove was killed, but to my knowledge, a single dove would not have enough blood to fill a bowl. Certainly, the second dove could never be immersed in the blood of the first dove.

Thus, we must recognize that "dipping" is not necessarily to immerse in the sense that we use the English word. The priest killed the first dove and allowed its blood to drip or squirt into a bowl. The second dove was pushed into the bowl and smeared with blood before being released. This is what it means to "dip". **It was a baptism of blood.**

Another instance of blood baptism is when the Mosaic covenant was established. Exodus 24:8 says,

"And Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people and said, Behold, the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words."

In the book of Hebrews we find the N.T. application relative to the New Covenant. Hebrews 12:24 says,

"And to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling that speaketh better things than that of Abel."

I believe this is what is meant in Heb. 10:19-22, where we read:

"Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus. Let us draw near with a



true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.”

This of course, speaks specifically of the ceremony on the Day of Atonement, rather than the establishing of the New Covenant. Nonetheless, it shows us that the mercy seat of the ark, where the high priest sprinkled that blood, is our heart. The mercy seat was sprinkled with blood, and therefore, we note that there is a blood baptism, as well as a water baptism and a Spirit (oil) baptism.

Three Baptisms: Water, Blood, and Oil

So actually, there are 3 baptisms: water, blood, and oil, dealing with the body, soul, and spirit. Each were administered under Moses, not by a true immersion, but by sprinkling, pouring, or smearing. It was not necessary to immerse the people in blood to ratify the Old Covenant. A sprinkling of blood served just as well.

It was not necessary to immerse or “dip” a man in oil in order to depict the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Oil poured on the head served to indicate, as Joel put it, to “pour out My Spirit upon all flesh”[of Israel, CIM](Joel 2:28). When the 120 disciples received the Spirit at Pentecost, it came as cloven tongues of fire sitting on their heads, not as an inundation or immersion of fire.

Thirdly, the water baptism was either poured or sprinkled upon the person in the time of his cleansing. He did not need to be immersed in water. Sprinkling or pouring was sufficient.

In every case, the mode of baptism in the law and prophets was meant to depict a work of God from heaven. It came from above.

This is the Law. God ministers Life; man can only minister death. Only living water can cleanse; dead (stagnant, not in motion) water is unclean. The baptism of the Spirit (oil) is poured out from on high. Only our True High Priest can sprinkle our hearts with His own blood.

These 3 baptisms are what the author had in mind in Heb. 6:2 when he mentioned “the doctrine of baptisms.” Since the book of Hebrews was written to people who were well versed in the law and in the temple ceremonies, it was assumed they already knew these things and did not need further explanation. But we today do need some further study on this, since we are in an entirely different culture and no longer observe most of these rituals.

Since Jesus’ death and resurrection, the baptism of blood has been entirely spiritualized, where Jesus sprinkles our hearts with His own blood. The baptism of oil is largely spiritualized as well, particularly in the matter of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. However, the anointing of oil is often done literally even today, such as in the case of anointing the sick for healing.

The one ritual that has been carried almost intact into the N.T. era has been water baptism. Thus, we will need to delve into this topic further. The questions we must answer are: What meanings have changed from the O.T. to the N.T.? Has there been a change in the mode of water baptism? If so, by what authority? How has the replacement of the Levitical priesthood with that of the Melchizedek Order affected N.T. baptism? We will try to answer these questions and more.

New Testament Baptism

We began with a study on “the doctrine of baptisms”(Heb. 6:2), showing that there are 3 distinct baptisms

in the Bible. The O.T. baptism of blood (Ex. 24:8) was administered by sprinkling and is spiritualized in Heb. 10:22, where he says that our hearts are sprinkled with the blood of Jesus. Since the soul is identified with the blood (Lev. 17:11), the baptism of blood deals with the cleansing of the soul.

There is also a baptism of oil, generally known as an “anointing,” administered by pouring upon the head or by dabbing some on the toe or ears (Lev. 14:17). The baptism of oil deals with the spirit.

The third baptism, that of water, was for the cleansing of the body, or (more properly) the flesh. We saw previously how the leper was baptized by sprinkling 7 times (Lev. 14:7) for the cleansing of his flesh. A leprous house was likewise cleansed by the sprinkling (baptism) of water 7 times (Lev. 14:51).

The prime OT example of baptism outside the law itself is found in the story of Naaman, the leper from Assyria, who was told to wash himself in the Jordan river 7 times.

The question for us now is how water baptism carries into the New Testament. Did John the Baptist radically change the OT mode of baptism and begin to immerse people? Is this what the word “baptism” means in the NT?

The Septuagint Translation’s Importance

The Greek word *baptizo* is said to literally mean “to dip or immerse.” But before we get into its usage in Classical Greek, let us first see how the word came into the Hebrew culture. This word was used in the Septuagint translations as early as 280 BC.

The Grecian empire had conquered about 50 years earlier and had brought the Greek language with them. They built Alexandria in Egypt and invited many Judahites to settle there. Within a couple of generations, their children could not even speak or read Hebrew, and so the need arose for a Greek translation of the Scriptures for them to use. Thus the Septuagint translation was made.

In this translation, when they came to the story of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. 4:33 and 5:21), where the king “was wet with the dew of heaven,” they used the Greek word *bapto* for “wet.” In other words, the king was baptized by dew. It would take a great deal of dew to immerse or dip someone in it, and so I have my doubts that this happened.

Secondly, when they came to the story of Naaman, they used the Greek word *baptizo* in 2 Kings 5:14 to describe Naaman’s actions at the Jordan river. As we pointed out in our last issue, Elisha had told Naaman to comply with God’s Law (Lev. 14:7) and “wash in Jordan 7 times.” Elisha may have been more specific with Naaman, but the writer of the story assumes you already know the law of sprinkling. So he does not bother to specify the mode of “baptism” here.

Nonetheless, this example is important because it links the law of sprinkling with the Greek word *baptizo*. The **Septuagint** translators settled upon this word as the nearest Greek equivalent, because the Greeks and Egyptians also “baptized” people in a religious initiation ceremony. The mode was different in those other religions, of course, but still it was an initiation ceremony of water.

The Egyptians Baptized by Immersion

Years ago as I was doing research on the mystery reli-

Important Reading:

TRUE CHRISTIAN GOVERNMENT

by Mark Allen Ludwig

Here is the Bible’s blueprint for human government, explained in detail from the scriptures. It has always been there, but we’ve been too busy justifying our own creations - our governments - to take the time to see God’s plan. Now you can see it though, here in these pages. With this blueprint comes a crystal clear vision for a better world at a time when nations are collapsing and strong men are trembling at the thought of the darkness that is falling on the world.

#608 @ sug don \$28.50



gions of Egypt, I ran across an interesting tidbit of information: The Egyptian baptismal ceremony was done by immersion in a coffin full of water. In fact, they held the person down until he passed out, then brought him up and revived him. If he survived, he became a member. He was considered to have been “dead and buried” in baptism.

At the time I had no idea that the Egyptians knew anything about baptism. In fact, I thought John the Baptist had gotten the idea by some kind of revelation. But in seeing that **the Egyptians immersed in water, and the Hebrews sprinkled**, the contrast was startling. Surely Moses would have been well acquainted with the Egyptian mode of baptism. He himself had probably been baptized by them in his early life. So when the law continually stresses **sprinkling**, rather than immersion, it had to have been a deliberate break with Egyptian practice.

Examples of Classical Greek “Baptism”

In Classical Greek, the word *baptizo* is used in connection with many different modes, substances, and subjects. **Modes** include pouring, sprinkling, immersing, dipping, and washing. **Substances** include water, blood, dyes, and molten metal. **Subjects** of baptism include ships, pottery, spears, soil, men, etc.

In its essential usage, the word *baptizo* does not really have reference to the mode of baptism. Rather it deals with **identification, fellowship, or union**. Sometimes this referred to a ship being baptized (when it sank under water). Other times the word was used to describe combing dye onto one’s hair to hide the gray hair. Brushing dye onto pottery to paint it with various colours was also called “baptism.”

The well-known theologian, Charles Hodge, in 1871 wrote in his **Systematic Theology**:

“The words *bapto*, *baptizo*, and their cognates, are used with such latitude of meaning, as to prove assertion that the command to baptize is a command to immerse, to be utterly **unauthorized and unreasonable.**” (III:526f)

I apologize for this terribly confusing sentence. To paraphrase him, he is saying that it is utterly unreasonable to assert that the command to baptize is a command to immerse, given the broad meaning of the word in Classical Greek. The mode of baptism cannot be ascertained by the so-called literal meaning of *baptizo*. The mode can only be identified by the context of the passage.

In Biblical matters, the context must include the Law as given to Moses.

Baptism in Jesus’ Day

Mark 7:1-4 gives us a direct reference to the OT practice of baptism.

“Then came together unto Him the Pharisees and certain of the scribes which came from Jerusalem. And when they saw some of His disciples eat bread with defiled, that is to say, with unwashen hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash (Greek, *nipto*) their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders (the Talmud). And when they come from the market, except they wash (Greek, *baptizo*) they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing (Greek, *baptismos*) of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and of tables.

There was no Law of God telling us that we had to wash hands before eating, or to wash all our cups and pots and

tables. In typical rabbinical fashion, they had stretched the law all out of proportion and applied it to everything but a monkey’s uncle. The original law on which this tradition was based is found in Num. 19:14-18, where the water of separation was to be sprinkled upon all the vessels **in a tent where a man had died**.

The spiritual principle of this law is manifest in the fact that you and I have a “tent” as well. It is this body, or “tabernacle”(2 Cor. 5:1). Since the death penalty was decreed upon Adam and all his descendants, we are quite literally a tent in which a man has died. And so, all vessels of that tent are unclean, including the heart, the kidneys, and all the internal organs, each of which represents aspects of our character or being.

This is why the priest had to wash the inward parts of a sacrifice (Lev. 1:13). It was done on the same principle of sprinkling the vessels in the tent of the dead man to cleanse the heart and soul of the dead man.

Baptism itself, applied to us today, still performs this function. It served to apply “living water” to the unclean vessels of the dead. (In Hebrew, **running** water is the same word as **living water**, and is why Jesus said the Spirit would flow from our inward parts as “*rivers of living water*” -- John 7:38).

The Pharisees had taken the law of Num. 19:14-18 and applied it incorrectly. The correct physical, OT application of the law was to sprinkle the vessels in a tent where a dead man had physically died.

The correct spiritual application is to see that WE are the tents with the dead man inside. Thus, we are in need of baptism, having our tents and our vessels washed with living water for

cleansing from the pollution of death that all have within.

One should not mix the metaphors by having to baptize all the physical vessels everyday. Those physical vessels needed cleaning only when they came into contact with one who was physically dead. So when the people in Jesus day baptized all the vessels every time they went out to the market (which was almost every day), this was done only by the “tradition of the elders”, which Jesus said often nullified the Law of God. This is made clear in verses 8 & 13, where Jesus answered His critics:

8 “For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups; and many other such like things ye do.

13 “Making the Word of God of none effect through your traditions, which ye have delivered; and many such like things ye do.”

This tradition was just one more burden that the Pharisees had placed upon the people in their zeal to be righteous. They needed to relax a bit and think of God as a Father, rather than as a strict taskmaster. God’s Law brought liberty and justice for all; man’s law brought oppression and bondage.

Sprinkling was a Baptism in Mark 7

Lightfoot’s commentary (1859) on this passage says:

They do not cleanse the hands [as to washing], until waters are poured upon the hands out of a vessel; for they do not wash the hands but out of a vessel.

Again he says:

*The word, therefore, **baptismos**, washings, applied to all these, properly and strictly is not to be taken of dip-*



ping or plunging, but, in respect of others, sprinkling only.

Here Lightfoot was commenting briefly on the mode by which baptism was commonly done in Jesus' day, and had been done since the days of Moses. It is obvious that the people would not have to carry their couches and tables and other vessels to the river (often miles away) to immerse them every time they returned from the market, or ate or slept.

So we see from Mark 7 that baptism was a common practice in Jesus' day, and that the Greek word *baptizo* was used to describe the act of sprinkling. Even though the word may have a literal Greek meaning of dipping or immersion, this was NOT how the word was actually applied in general Hebrew usage. Mark 7:4 makes this quite clear.

Also note that Mark uses the term *nupto* and *baptizo* interchangeably. Previously in talking about Naaman, Elisha told him to wash (Heb. *rachats*) in Jordan 7 times. But verse 14 says he dipped (Heb. *tabal*) 7 times. It appears that those Hebrew terms were essentially interchangeable in the OT as well.

How Was Jesus Baptized?

When Jesus came to John for baptism, John at first objected, saying, "I have need to be baptized of Thee." John was baptizing for repentance from sin. Jesus did not need to repent of sin, so his baptism seemed pointless.

There was another reason why Jesus had to be baptized. It was because this was the first step in consecrating the priest. We pointed this out in a previous publication. (FFI #71, Dec 94). The high priest (and his sons) were first washed with water, then given the garments (which were later sprinkled with blood and oil), and they were anointed with oil. See Exodus 29:4-8.

Jesus baptism was step 1 of this consecration to the high priesthood. Thus, His baptism was to "fulfill all righteousness" (Matt 3:15), but NOT to repent of sin. It was to fulfill the requirements of the Law for those entering the priesthood.

The next question is, How did John baptize? Did he immerse, or did he sprinkle or pour water upon the people? The REAL question is, did he "fulfill all righteousness" according to the Law, or did he do something new that was more akin to the Egyptian mode of baptism into their mystery religion?

I think it is self evident that since John himself was from a priestly family (Luke 1), he would have learned how to baptize in the lawfully prescribed manner. He would have been an expert in all of the "diverse washings" (Heb 9:10) performed in the temple.

If John's mode of baptism had been radically different from that done in the temple, you can be certain the Pharisees would have found fault with it. Yet there is no biblical record that they questioned him even once on his mode of baptism. Some have made a big deal of Matt 3:16, where it says:

"And Jesus, when He was baptized, went UP straight-way out of the water...."

This, they say, means Jesus was immersed. But it does not say that. Jesus may have stepped in up to his waist, as the pictures sometimes show. The act of baptism itself, however, does not depend on how deep the water is, or how far into the water one walks. Baptism is done when the baptizer pours water over his head or sprinkles him upon his head.

Remember the basic story of the 2 doves? Jesus was

here fulfilling the Law of Leviticus 14:5, where the first dove (first work of Jesus) is described:

"And the priest shall command that one of the birds be killed in an earthen vessel over running water."

Jesus came to John as the first bird in an earthen vessel (physical body - see 2 Cor 4:7). He was then "killed" by baptism, because he was offering Himself to John as the fulfillment of that first dove. John was baptizing Him unto death at that point. Even as the people would select the passover lambs on the 10th day of the 1st month (3-1/2 days before the lambs were slain), so also John was selecting Jesus as the True Passover Lamb 3-1/2 years before He would be actually slain.

So John "killed" Jesus over the running water of the Jordan river. It was done to fulfill all righteousness, and certainly the Law was fulfilled to the letter. The baptism itself was performed above the running water, NOT UNDER it. God then put His stamp of approval, as we read in Matthew 3:16,

"..... and lo, the heavens were opened unto Him, and He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon Him."

Once we know the law of Leviticus 14, it is easy to see how Jesus fulfilled the law here at His baptism. And to understand the mode of baptism, one needs only to study the relevant Law. However, there are some mitigating circumstances. Jesus was not a leper being cleansed from leprosy any more than He was a sinner being baptized unto repentance. So it is doubtful if He was sprinkled 7 times with water. More than likely, John poured or sprinkled water upon Him just once, as prescribed in the Law regarding the consecra-

tion of priests.

John Baptized at Aenon (John 3:23)

One of the places that John baptized people was at Aenon, which means "springs", John 3:23 says:

"And John also was baptizing in Aenon near to Salim, because there was much water there."

Those who have visited the place in recent years tell us that there are many springs of water coming out of the hillside. In fact, the phrase "much water" in the verse above should actually read **many springs**. There is not enough water to form pools of water, unless done artificially. So it is unlikely that John immersed people there. Yet there would be ample water for sprinkling.

The reason John went to Aenon was because every Spring season the Jordan overflowed its banks and became quite muddy and turbulent. So John moved to Aenon or even to Bethabara (John 1:28), where the springs of water remained pure and clean.

3000 Baptized on the Day of Pentecost

We find in Acts 2:41 that 3000 people were baptized on the day of Pentecost. Few seem to question how and where they were baptized. There was always a water shortage in Palestine. There were only 2 pools of water in Jerusalem that served as their water supply: Siloam and Bethesda. One can only imagine what the priests would have done if the disciples had spent all day immersing 3000 people in the city water supply.

Though we are not told how they were baptized, the author of Acts assumes the readers had studied the Law and know the mode prescribed there.

The Ethiopian Eunuch (Acts 8)

Now Available:

Israel's Identity IT MATTERS!

by Ted R. Weiland

"Strictly speaking, it is incorrect to call an ancient Israelite a 'Jew' or to call a contemporary Jew and 'Israelite' or a 'Hebrew'" The Jewish Almanac. To whom does it matter? It matters to today's Edomite Jews, to Israel's enemies, to true Israel, to future generations of Israel's children, to Arabs, it matters to God!

814 @ sug don \$5.50



On the way home from preaching the gospel in Samaria, Philip was led by the Spirit to go to Gaza (8:26). There he found an Ethiopian eunuch in a chariot reading Isaiah 53, about the lamb led to the slaughter. He did not understand the passage, so Philip told him that it referred to Jesus, who had recently been crucified as the Lamb of God. The eunuch believed this, and then wanted to be baptized.

“And he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him.”

First, the word “into” the water is the Greek word *eis*. Bullinger says of this word:

“Euclid uses eis when a line is drawn to meet another line at a certain point. Hence, it denotes motion to or unto an object, with the purpose of reaching or touching it.”

So Acts 8:38 cannot be construed to mean Philip and the Eunuch had to actually go INTO the water and be immersed. It simply reads that they went to the water.

Nonetheless, the mode of baptism is not stated here. To discover the mode, we must look at the context of the passage. The eunuch was reading Isaiah 53. If we go back to the passage in the OT, we find that that section actually begins with Isaiah 52:13. So let us begin quoting where the eunuch probably started reading....

“Behold, My Servant shall deal prudently, He shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high. As many were astonished at Thee; His visage was so marred more than any man, and His form more than the sons of men; So shall He sprinkle many nations; the kings shall cut their mouths at Him; for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider [i.e. understand]”.

The Ethiopian eunuch was the specific type, or forerunner, in the fulfillment of this prophecy. It was a prophecy that many nations would be “sprinkled”, or baptized, cleansed from death and spiritual leprosy. Further, as the last part of verse 15 says, they would be given understanding. That was Philip’s role in this. It was to give the eunuch “understanding” of things he did not see or understanding before that moment.

So if anything, we must conclude that the eunuch was **sprinkled**, not immersed, for this would be the fulfillment of the prophecy in question. The word “sprinkle” used in Isaiah 52:15 is from the Hebrew word *nazah*. It is the same word used in Lev. 14:7, where the leper was sprinkled 7 times with water.

Conclusion

In studying the Law, one can only conclude that there were 3 baptisms: blood, water, and oil. They were all administered from above in some way, to denote God’s action toward men. They were given for the cleansing of the entire person: spirit, soul, and body.

This is “the doctrine of baptisms” that Hebrews 6:2 mentions. The Law clearly prescribes sprinkling or pouring as the mode of baptism. There is no evidence that John radically changed the mode of baptism, but that he fulfilled the Law as he had learned it. N.T. baptism gives us an increased understanding of its purpose and application, but there is no reason to change to immersion.

Courtesy *God’s Kingdom Ministries*, Fridley, MN

A LESSON IN GOOD DONKEY BEHAVIOUR
by Adam de Witt

I am becoming ever so troubled by an awareness, of those who claim to be closer to King Jesus than the average dozy churchgoer. I find that few are free of the woe I will deal with. It seems that most of these are making up their own minds how to ‘peg’ others. That is to say, so and so is no good because he believes this or that. I would agree that it is not good when someone teaches some matters wrongly. But let me tell all who read this, not one of you teach all things rightly. I have heard and read teachings from most of the ‘well-knowns’ of Christian Identity, and British-Israelism, and I cannot think of one with whom I am in full agreement. **ALL fall short**, there is none who are righteous, no not one, **not even I**. Has anyone ever asked why this is so?

Is it because some are simply evil? Well that could be. However, I wonder if there is another cause. If people thought someone was right on all points, then men would follow him, even worship him, rather than the true King. Aha, some will cry, a letter to tell us to forgive Pete

Peters. This is **not** a letter to white-wash Pete Peters. I personally feel he has brought much woe upon himself by slandering others in the King’s thaneship (service), largely for the very reasons I have afore stated. I think that the Israelite teaching is a “called our” of the churches teaching to sunder or hallow (set apart) the Groom-throng (the Saxons who are the body) from the Bride-throng (the Saxons of the churches). We need to be wiser than the Bride-throng and not fall for her womanly weakness of getting a thrill out of a ‘soapy’ life-style.

Yes, we all get hurt by someone but it must not lead to bitterness. I agree that those who slander and gossip **openly** are breaking God’s law and of those men beware.

Yet I find there are others who do not do so and are yet shunned outrightly. This, simply, because they teach somethings amiss or what is seen to be amiss, which all of us do. Having said this, this letter is not a call to build an all-including C.I. front, not matter what some teach, far from it. I feel it is best that all C.I. teachers work alone but to a point, for sometimes that is the only way to learn the word. Yet when I say alone, I do not mean as a monk, but as a man seeking leading not from a minister but from Jesus, yet always willing to be aware that Jesus will use a donkey to get an errand to you.

This surely does not fit a system of elders and deacons. Some will say that the church was given a set of rules as to setting up a structure of leaders. That may be so for the churches, the Bride-throng, but not so for the Body-throng. This latter group is to be made up of men who have only Jesus as the head. Such men are led by only two things, themselves and the King. Hopefully more of the King will lead them than their flesh. The failing lies in the flesh being the strongest might, but what else is new? Seeing that none of us are in the renewed flesh, personal loves will cloud teachings in some areas. Thus we are hamstrung by our own flesh and will often try to use God’s Word to deem right our own personal bents. These ‘bents’ are set by our influences and so for one, the love of seeing all two-legged creatures saved, his ‘bent’ is UNIVERSALISM. For another it is the love to be able to bid to the Lord better and he has fallen into the belief that this can be done by saying just the right words and are into holy names or tongue-speaking. For others

New Tapes:

- K-419 **The Wars of David**, Pt 1,
(Character of Saul & David series, Pt 37)
- K-420 **The Wars of David**, Pt 2, Bruggeman
- K-421 **David & Bathsheba**, Pt 1 - series 39
- K-422 **David & Bathsheba**, Pt 2 - series 40
James Bruggeman
- S-934 **Unsung Heroes & Simple Faith**, P.P.
- S-935 **Dealing With It**, Pete Peters
- S-936 **Is Peace Possible With Forced Vaccinations?** Pete Peters
- S-937 **NDE’s - Don’t Be Deceived**, Peters
- S-938 **Radio B’cast on Luke 11:21**, Peters



who have found out that Adamites are something else to the other races, they can't see that Adam in Genesis 2 was not the first Adamite.

Others have been brought up to love the fellowship that is part of churchianity and loves a church structure of sorts, and so on - although we must **not forsake assembling ourselves together, as the manner of some [is]; but exhorting [one another]; and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching.** (Heb 10:25). Thus all come from a host of backgrounds and none can suffer the warped 'bents' of the others over his. What do we do?

Well, we who are wise in a field of truth can show by God's Word the error of the others' thinking, but being mindful ALWAYS that maybe, we could be wrong. Can we always do a good job at this? NO! Let this be a rule of thumb. Anyone who has heard the call to leave either the church throng (wheat group) or the secular throng (grape group) because their husks or flesh is readily winnowed by the breath of God's Word, (thus they need neither threshing or crushing because they are the 'called-out' of the "called out" [barley throng], then they MUST be able to be Humble towards others [in their group]. This means, too blooming bad if you do not agree with others as others do not agree with you. You are part of a minority of Saxons and not one of them is the same as you, be ready for a shock, don't await (expect) agreement on all things from anyone. **I hate Universalism**, yet one universalist has a deeper understanding of many law themes than I and so many other folks. Another who likes church-like structures and is fixed on his Adam teaching is nevertheless an outstanding thinker on race and the links to God's plan.

Another has a good understanding of whom Jesus is, and has done an outstanding pry into outlining the case. Another has been a steady worker bringing to light the wiles of the interlopers who call themselves Jews, yet is stuck on the 'devil' as a spook rather than an old slanderer and anti-worker of flesh and blood. Another is very vehement on baptism being ONLY by adult immersion, while having done a great work on the Israel People as a people of God. Another has done excellent work showing the connection between Old Testament Baptism and New Testament Baptism, but is hung on universalism. Some have done a great job promoting the Israel message, yet condemn the Germans as Assyrians. And so we could go on! The real task is not to all get together and be a 'chummy bunch,' that thought is daft and unworkable. God has made us to be selflings (individuals) under His Son - although in a familial and ongoing covenant relationship. We are like captains of a shipping business. We all work for the same boss, yet we will deal with our ship and crew as we understand to be apt within out fleshly knowledge of the boss' rules. We are Covenanted selflings under hire, with crews; yet somehow lonesome, yet nevertheless part of a body. Thus our fellowship is like a fellowship of captains, bound by a common boss but apart due to our task. Captains can thus not take behestings from other captains but they can learn from each other if only they'd be humble enough to admit that they do not know which captains are hirelings of the boss. Yes, I hear some say that the Bible teaches fellowship, true. **"Jesus as was his custom, went to the synagogue (meeting place) on the Sabbath Day."** And all through the book of Acts, they met every sabbath day. We all know that they met weekly for fellowship and encouragement. Therefore so should we seek each other out weekly, for "fellowship" discussion of Bible topics and Bible Law and other Scriptural issues and to seek God's face and praise His Name in song!

I tend to think [my opinion] that this is more for the Bride-throng. That's what churchgoers need. We all need fellowship but the needs vary for each selfling, however we

need to consider others in this also! The fellowship we attend may not be for our benefit, but our presence may benefit others (including our children who learn fellowship with the group instead of with the world outside). It helps to strengthen and encourage us. Hence we are admonished **"not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another..."** [as the Psalmist says, **"A day spent in thy house of praise, Is better than a thousand days, Spent in the realm of earthly splendour. Though only at Thy door I wait, No tents of sin give joy so great."** - Ps 84 harmonized, and **"My soul was glad when unto me, They said come, we will now repair; Unto Jehovah's house of prayer. There to adore His majesty."** - Ps 122 harmonized]. We can however work together trusting that Jesus does guide those those other selflings, even though the others may not be the ones we would like. Some we don't like for their lack of grasping what we see is so truthful, but some flesh is simply tougher than others and needs more tenderising by the thresher, King Jesus.

I'll give a hint how this non-chummy working together would work. One man, and I'll name him, takes that which tallies from newspapers, magazines and newsletters with the Holy Writ, or that which makes a relevant point that can be handled as a tale to strengthen or teach something outlined in the Holy Writ. Thusly he gathers the most fitting quotes, sayings, or stories into a newsletter; he is Hank Roelofs (Christian Identity Ministries). This means that he has reprinted stuff from all of those mentioned above - but this also means that he has reprinted stuff from someone you don't like. I bet that many of you who get his newsletter, often look at the writers' names of the chosen articles and may, because of a name, have chosen not to read what is written (either in the newsletter or in the attachments) by that someone you have deemed as a foe or a fool. Thus you may even have deemed Hank a foe or a fool for reprinting anything from such a one. He even prints articles or books that may contain items he does not agree with, but because the overall thrust of the particular writing is deemed to be beneficial and instructive.

Yet let me say this, Hank was not given the gift to be either a preacher or a teacher, he is neither a speaker nor a writer as such. He compiles, and prints, and publishes booklets, and helps people in the ways that he can. In the Holy Writ, God calls all Israelites, donkeys. Hank, like myself and ALL OF YOU, and I'm sure you can take it, are called donkeys. It is for this reason that of all of God's beings he picked a real donkey to talk through. The point God made was, that He can even speak through anyone of us donkeys. So with this in mind, God has given 'donkey' Hank the shrewdness (discernment) to pick from a pack of donkeys, articles, which are written by donkeys who nevertheless have written truth from the King.

The shrewdness to pick what is a donkey cry, or the Word of God through the donkey is a form of working together, because he gathers from all (at least many) of God's donkeys. That is working together. I'll put it another way. Picking the good fruit from struggling trees and putting the best fruits thereof all together to put forth a good monthly food hamper, is the togethered working of all the trees.

This then does **NOT** make Hank anyone's lackey, other than that of the King. It is a let down to find that those who do not know Hank from a bar of soap, can make false claims with a surety of heart. I also know that others will say, you are white-washing Hank, you have not seen the other side of him. That may be so, but who has seen the other side of me, or you, and you, and you -



and so on. Indeed, I hope that only God and His Son know the other side of me, as it is not something to be proud of. We need to be able to trust that the King has chosen us, Trust. Faith is simply a Pig-Latin word for trust. So do you have that trust? Then if you do have that trust, why then be so fearful to learn from another donkey? Jesus will train you in the skills of shrewdness and so you will know what is of Him, or what is of the donkey. No need to love the loathsome donkey to bits.

Peters was unable to do this, and the outcome that which we now see. All who are not into dunking, and/or strip King Jesus of being God, are Jews according to him. Hang on - I've heard it said that all who are into dunking are hirelings of the Jews to spread cabalistic ritual, or are carrying on a practice of the ancient Egyptians; God immersed some Egyptians, too. Well, who's right? Maybe a little humility will lead us to truth rather than being stiff-necked, or would one say, I'm not stiff-necked, I'm steadfast. Please yourself. But remember, we are always right until proven wrong. And be ready, always for the latter. There is no need for trust if we knew it all. There will always be some whom we simply will find hard to get on with.

Ade W.



9.1 *Why did the Judeans not associate with the Samaritans? Were not the Samaritans true Israelites? If not, what was the genetic relationship?*

Samaria was the capital city of the 10-tribed House of Israel during the time of the divided kingdom before the captivities. It was built by king Omri of Israel, and thus the Assyrians called Israel by the name Beth-Khumri ("House of Omri").

In 724 BC Shalmanezar began the siege of Samaria, and the city fell to his successor, Sargon, three years later. The Assyrians deported 27,280 people from the city, as almost all of them had already been deported earlier. Even so, many of the Israelites were left behind.

Sargon settled many colonists from Babylonia and Hamath (2 Kings 17:24), and his grandson, Esarhaddon, and later monarchs continued this policy by introducing Elamites into the land as well. Thus, they had an "integrated society."

During this time the foreign colonists, who were idolators, decided that the local gods of the land were unfavorable to them, so they requested that an Israelite from the Assyrian captivity come and teach them the ways of their God. The result was a curious mixture of idolatry and the Law of Moses. (They rejected the writings of the prophets, accepting only the Law of Moses).

These were the people that the Judeans found in the land two centuries later when they returned to rebuild Jerusalem and the temple. When Ezra and Nehemiah would have nothing to do with those who had intermarried **and** those who had a mixed religion, the conflict began between the Judeans and the "Samaritans," as they came to be called. One of the Samaritan governors, Sanballat (Neh 2:10) opposed the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem. He later built the Samaritan temple on Mt. Gerizim. Their doctrines did not differ greatly from that of the Judean Sadducees of Jesus' day.

So to answer your question, the Judeans did not associate with the Samaritans, because of their conflict recorded in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Some of the Samaritans, at least originally, were of Israelite stock, being "leftovers" from the Assyrian captivity. (as was the woman Jesus met at

the well, in John 4). However, as time passed, there would have been fewer and fewer of them who remained unmixed (as is intended for Israel today by all the alien immigration!), especially since those who could prove their pure genealogy were welcomed into the Judean community.

9.2 *Were Galileans also referred to as Judeans, or were they distinctly separate?*

Galilee was a province in northern Palestine that had been settled by the tribe of Benjamin after the Babylonian captivity. The Judahites settled in the southern part of the territory, eventually forming a province called "Judea." The term "Galilean" is a purely geographical term, since there is no "tribe of Galilee," as is with Judea (Judah). Jesus was a Galilean by geography (street address), according to Luke 23:6, because He lived in Galilee. However, by genealogy he was a Judahite.

On occasion the term Judean ("Jew") is used in the Old Testament sense, where it includes Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, who were of the southern House of Judah. Thus, we find in places like Romans 1:16 that the term Judean includes the Galileans (Benjaminites) as well as the Judeans. Usually, however, the word Judean is used to distinguish that person from a Galilean or a Samaritan.

9.3 *Were the Rothschilds Jews? How did they get so powerful that they controlled nations and gave money to Lenin in support of communism?*

Yes, the Rothschilds are Jews. Stephen Birmingham's book, *Our Crowd - Great Jewish Families of New York* states on pages 24 and 25 (speaking of another Jew, August Schonberg): "He wanted to make money. At thirteen he went to Frankfurt - it is likely that he ran away from home - and went to work as an unpaid apprentice for the Rothschilds, the leading Jewish banking house in Europe."

The house of Rothschild (i.e. "Red Shield") became powerful through banking, which gave them the right to create money. But they always had to be somewhat fearful that this right to create money would be taken away from them by the monarchs of Europe or by the people themselves. Thus, they decided it was in their best interests to gain absolute power over the people and governments. (Of course, they had always sought to gain power over us). For further reading into the way they financed communism and took over Russia, see **Behind Communism**, by Frank Britton (#308 @ \$11.90). [for more on the creation of money, see the cartoon, **Goldsmith & the Temple of the 13 Suns**, #499 @ \$2 for 5 copies]

9.4 *I didn't see it in the Bible, but I heard it said that the yellow race will rule the world. Is this true?*

No matter what race or religion you study, you will find that almost all of them believe that theirs will someday rule the world. It is rooted in the age-old argument: whose god is the most powerful? It has always been assumed that the most powerful and prosperous people is the one who has the most powerful god. To put it another way, each God has its own "chosen people" who worship that god, and the chosen people of the most powerful god will eventually rule the world.

The religion of Christian Israel is no exception. The name "Israel" means ruling with God. When God married Israel at Mt. Sinai, He gave her authority over His household (creation - see Psalm 104). The main difference between our God and foreign gods in this matter is that our God will not allow His wife to misrule His creation. Thus, as long as Israel is in violation of His Law, God does not expect the other nations to concur in her sin and be obedient to her self-made laws. That is why God has turned most nations against us today.

But to answer your question directly, the Bible does

