



Christian Identity Ministries
in conjunction with N.O. Fellowship of God's Covenant People
PO Box 146, CARDWELL QLD 4849, Australia

A member of the
Congregations of
Israel

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!*

#240

Covenant Messenger

March AD2006

"AN EXAMINATION OF PETER'S VISION"

by Pastor Don Elmore

INTRODUCTION

It is surprising how little "proof" must be given to convince the average "Christian" to forsake God's PLAIN commandments. And in a few cases, the same biblical story can be used to provide support for two totally diverse interpretations that challenge two entirely different sets of commandments. One such story (Acts 10:1--11:18) is the vision that the Apostle Peter had while he was staying at Simon the tanner's house in Joppa.

Many biblical teachers of modern Christianity use this story of Peter's vision in an attempt to prove that ALL animals are now suitable for eating. And other biblical teachers use this same story of Peter's vision to prove that ALL races are now suitable for the inheritance of the New Covenant. And, remarkably some even teach both positions!

The latter interpretation replaces **God's clear list** of foods "that may be eaten" (Leviticus 11:2,9,21,22,47) and foods "that may not be eaten" (Leviticus 11:4, 8, 11, 13, 42, 47) with an unwritten fuzzy code that all foods MAY be eaten—although many are not eaten since they are unappetizing or unappealing. This dietary deregulation asserts that since the beginning of the new covenant--cats, dogs, horses, rats, hogs, buzzards, snakes, monkeys, bats, oysters, clams, shrimp, catfish and other like animals have been candidates for the dinner table, but few except for the swine and shell fish (probably because they taste good, or appear more appealing) ever actually make it to the table.

This is in spite of reliable medical knowledge that some foods should be avoided because of their potential harm to the eater's body—for example: Doctors regularly recommend the elimination of pork from the diet of a person who has heart problems or high blood pressure.

"Food cooked and seasoned with pork products, and fried dishes that are usually cooked with either *lard* or hydrogenated vegetable oil are high in trans fat. Unfortunately, frequent consumption of these ingredients contributes to *obesity, hypertension, diabetes and cardiac/circulatory problems.*"

Nevertheless, the average mainstream Christian is convinced, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that there are now NO FOODS that are restricted by God for His people to consume. They arrive at this conclusion because they believe that the unclean animals in Peter's vision were literally cleansed. Therefore, all animals, including shrimp, catfish, oysters, lobsters, sting rays, carp, clams, snails, turtles, frogs, rabbits, squirrels, mice, moles, swine, sea gulls, camels, eagles, pelicans, tigers, lions, wolves, snakes, cats, dogs, rhinoceroses, elephants, giraffes, etc.—all forbidden

for hundreds of years by the commandment of God were suddenly and magically changed to being permitted for consumption. But a careful reading of Acts 10 and the first part of Acts 11 reveals that **PETER'S VISION HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH CHANGING FOOD LAWS.**

The former interpretation of modern Christianity is used to justify the erroneous belief in the universal message of the Kingdom of God. By viewing the animals in Peter's sheet as being symbolic and not literal, an entirely different meaning is given. They understand the meaning of Peter's vision to be that non-covenant peoples of all races were symbolically cleansed. The consequences of this view have been very crucial in reshaping both the modern churches' missionary destinations and its culture. In addition, their mis-identification of what was symbolized have aided in the development of the anti-Christian multi-cultural world order. The fallacy of this belief is that it ignores the history of the Kingdom of God—in particular the history, prophecies and promises of the House of Israel. But a careful reading of the Old Testament reveals that PETER'S VISION HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH CHANGING THE RECIPIENTS OF GOD'S COVENANT.

Both of the above interpretations are popular and politically correct in today's modern churches. Sadly, most preachers have never considered the possibility that these doctrines are wrong. But both interpretations when examined closely lack the necessary proof of the Scriptures.

THE LITERAL INTERPRETATION:

This view promotes the idea that the prohibition against eating

IN THIS ISSUE:

An Examination of Peter's Vision,	1
Let Go and Let God,	6
Yah's Laws, pt 6,	7
Home Schooling Saves Your Child from Destruct.,	8
Working Character into Your Children,	9
If You Believe, Why Don't You Listen?	11
Body Piercing and Painting,	11
Keep or Change?	12
New Testament Christians.....	12

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

certain meats is no longer valid.

Mainstream teachers agree that Jesus did not teach that the meat laws had been changed—in fact, they agree that Jesus maintained that these health laws were still in effect. The altering of these laws, according to those who teach the literal interpretation, did not occur until several years AFTER the death, burial, resurrection and ascension of Jesus. The supposed major change in the dietary regulations of God's people occurred with a vision given to Peter while he was staying in the city of Joppa.

During the unusual vision, three times Peter emphatically insisted, *"I have never eaten ANYTHING that is common or unclean."* (Acts 10:14,16). Thus it is clear that Peter was still keeping the food restrictions of beasts, fish, birds and insects that God had given to His people (Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14).

Bible commentators like Matthew Henry concur that Peter had never gratified his appetite with any forbidden food. However, Matthew Henry adds that:

"God, by a second voice from heaven, proclaimed the repeal of the law in this case (v 15). *What God hath cleansed, that call thou not common.* He that made the law might alter it when he pleased. He has now taken off the restraint, has cleansed that which was before polluted to us. We ought to welcome it as a great mercy; not so much because hereby we gain the use of swine's flesh, hares, rabbits, and other **pleasant and wholesome food** for our bodies, but chiefly because conscience is hereby freed from a yoke in things of this nature" (The Matthew Henry Commentary: Acts chapter 10, verses 9-18).

If Matthew Henry and other commentators with a similar viewpoint are correct, it is puzzling why Jesus did not give any indication that the list of non-approved animals for eating would be eliminated after His departure. Even Peter, after ministering with Jesus for over three years, was yet *"perplexed [doubted within himself] what this vision which he had seen [three times] should mean.."* (Acts 10:17a). Why after obeying the laws of God pertaining to the proper meats to eat for his entire life, would it be suddenly changed? And why was it revealed just to him?

So, according to the literal interpretation, minutes before Peter's vision it was an abomination to God for any covenant person to eat swine's flesh, but seconds afterwards it was not! Did this cleansing of unclean animals happen simultaneously all over the world—or was it just for Peter or until he could get the word out?

And is Matthew Henry correct about God withholding *"pleasant and wholesome food from our bodies"*? Does he think that God did not allow His people to eat certain foods for no health reasons at all? I wonder why he did not list the "pleasant" rodent and the "wholesome" poisonous frog as cleansed animals ready for consumption. The animals that God restricted from His people's diet were harmful to their bodies—**just as they still are today.**

Peter didn't understand the vision at first. In fact, he resisted three times the voice that said, *"Rise Peter, kill and EAT"* (Acts 10:13). Peter refused to eat any forbidden animal! And continued to do so the rest of his life.

At the time of the vision Peter **did not know** that three men, two slaves and a soldier, were about to ask him to accompany them back to Caesarea to the house of Corne-

lius. Peter also **did not know** that God had told Cornelius to send these men (Acts 10:5-9). What Matthew Henry and others fail to explain is how the changing of the food laws fits the context of this situation.

Read carefully what Peter told the men at Cornelius' house as to what God had shown him. Peter did NOT tell them that the dietary laws were altered! Nor is there any verse in the Bible where it records Peter telling anyone of this major change. If the vision meant that animals like the pig were now permissible meat for meals, **WHY DIDN'T PETER TELL ANYONE?**

PETER'S INTERPRETATION OF HIS VISION TO OTHERS

When Peter explained his vision episode to others, he never told them anything about the diet restrictions being changed. Instead, what Peter explained to Cornelius he consistently repeated to others—that although it was unlawful for him to visit and keep company with Cornelius and his kinsmen—he did visit them because of the lesson of his vision.

Peter later repeated this same evaluation of what God showed him to the men at Jerusalem (Acts 11:1-11) and to the council that was held there several years later (Acts 15:7-11, 14). Peter never testified that God had shown him, while he was at Joppa, that all animals that were previously either common or unclean were now fit to eat.

When the **astonishing** things that happened at Cornelius' house (Acts 10:45) became known to the Apostles and brethren that were in Judea (Acts 11:1), they contended with Peter about it when he arrived at Jerusalem (Acts 11:2). But the contention was NOT OVER THE CHANGE IN DIETARY MEAT LAWS! The Apostles

and brethren that were at Judea were circumcised and they challenged Peter as to why he *"wentest in to men uncircumcised and didst eat with them"* (Acts 11:2). The contention was that Peter being circumcised had eaten with men who were uncircumcised. (Note here that Peter did not tell these uncircumcised men they needed to be circumcised! CIM).

In answering their objection to his behaviour, Peter *"reviewed the matter from the beginning"* (v.4), that is, he told the story of the vision of the common and unclean animals that were on the great sheet that were cleansed, the visit of the three men sent by Cornelius and the events that happened when he went to Cornelius' house (Acts 11:5-17). After finishing his story, the contenders were very satisfied with the reason that Peter gave for his having eaten with uncircumcised (unclean) men—for they *"held their peace and glorified God"* (v. 18).

Then they gave their concluding statement of the incident to Peter. Notice that they said nothing about the pig now being allowable for consumption, but that *"then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life"* (Acts 11:18).

A little while later, another disputation arose. This time the matter of dissension was over the teaching made by certain of the brethren from Jerusalem that *"Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved"* (Acts 15:1,2). So there was arranged the Council at Jerusalem, attended by the apostles and elders for the purpose of settling this question.

After much disputing, the Apostle Peter rose up and

New Videos MARTIAL LAW - THE RISE OF THE POLICE STATE by Alex Jones

Out of the ashes of the September 11th tragedy, a dark empire of war and tyranny has risen. The Constitution has been shredded and America is now a Police State. This film exposes not just who was behind the 9-11 attacks, but the roots and history of its orchestrators.

#CI-395 DVD LOAN ONLY \$5



spoke (v.7). He referred again to the incident at Joppa and Cornelius' house. he briefly summarized the event by stating that God had "put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith" (v.9). Nothing was said about unclean animals being purified, but that the hearts of "them" were cleansed. The "them" that Peter referred to were a particular group of men, women, and children—not animals!

Why don't commentators like Matthew Henry consider that if the question of **circumcision** caused so much discussion and disputations in the early church, why didn't the supposed lifting of the unclean food ban? But wouldn't the total lifting of the classification between clean and unclean animals, which had been in effect for thousands of years, [Noah knew about them] cause a much greater contention in the early church? Especially since the notice of this drastic change was given to only one of the apostles—in a vision—in the house of a tanner—in the coastal city of Joppa!

The SILENCE in the Scriptures about any contention over this matter proves that the sheet vision of Peter had nothing to do with animals. And what about the Priests in the Temple? There is no record of their sacrificing formerly unclean animals—in fact, the citizenry still got very upset when foreign armies sacrificed pigs on the Temple's altar. There is absolutely no biblical evidence that the supposed change in unclean animals occurred.

SUMMARY

To state that Peter's vision is the reason that Christians are now allowed to eat unclean foods, is an invalid interpretation of Scripture. It not only completely ignores the context of the story, the purpose of the vision, but also Peter's own explanation to Cornelius and others.

A major problem in the early church dealt with the issue of circumcision—especially the circumcised keeping company and/or eating with the uncircumcised. This is the issue that the vision to Peter concerned—not the food laws! As to believe otherwise, leads to many more questions, such as:

1. What would changing the lunch menu have to do with the Apostle Peter going with the three men to Cornelius' house and preaching to him and his kin the gospel?
2. What is the connection between the vision being shown three times to Peter and the fact that three unknown men were soon to appear at his house?
3. Why would Peter be given the information that it was okay to eat unclean animals when the people to whom he was sent had been eating unclean animals all their lives?
4. Why are unclean fish included in the new list of clean animals when there were no unclean fish in Peter's sheet? ONLY four-footed beasts, wild beasts, creeping things, and fowl were present on the sheet in Peter's vision (Acts 10:20)
5. Did Peter's vision affect the altering of the prohibition of the other food laws:
 - a. The law against drinking blood?
 - b. The law against eating certain parts (heart liver, intestines) of clean animals?
 - c. The law against eating animals that died of themselves?
6. What changed the unclean animals to clean ani-

mals? Was it the blood of Jesus? NO!!

7. Were there any prophetic messages that indicated that this important change would take place? NO!!

8. Was it now permissible to touch the dead carcass of the swine? NO!!

The above questions are rarely, if ever, addressed. And no wonder. For they cause the advocates of the literal interpretation of Peter's vision a great dilemma. for if the biological characteristics that made the particular animals unclean were changed, then these newly purified animals would be DIFFERENT animals.

For example, if a pig's characteristics were changed (three additional stomachs, the ability to sweat, etc.), then it would prohibit the pigs from performing the function "garbage men" that they were created to do.

The advocates of the literal position imply that the unclean animals were not of themselves unwholesome or unhealthy to eat. And that there were no biological or health reasons for their being on the rejected list of foods to eat. But that is simply not true.

When God gave to Israel the rule that only beasts that (1) divided the hoof and (2) chewed the cud were healthy for them to eat. He was also saying that any animal that did not have these two characteristics were either dangerously toxic, contained a high fat content or had some other unhealthy reason as to why it was harmful for it to be consumed. God had **sound biological health principles** that were the basis of His condemnation!

"FILTHY AS A PIG"

For if any animal was dangerously toxic or contained a high fat content PRIOR to the vision given to Peter and still has these same unhealthy characteristics

today—then how could this animal now be good to eat? For example, God specifically commanded His people NOT to eat swine (hog or pig) meat:

"And the swine, because it divideth the hoof yet cheweth not the cud, it is unclean unto you; ye shall not eat of their flesh nor touch their dead carcasses" (Deut 14:8).

Because the pig does not chew the cud, it was and is a very unhealthy animal to eat. For it was not created by God to be a food source, but to be a living garbage disposal. (like dogs, who can turn fat and bones into fertilizer overnight, which otherwise would take a long time to break down. CIM). Its job is to eat almost anything—thereby keeping the farm clean from decaying vegetables, maggots, decaying animal flesh, urine, excrement, dirt, food scraps, poisonous snakes, etc.

To be able to digest all of this normally inedible garbage, its digestive system is understandably different than other animals. The pig has only one stomach, unlike the cow which has four. It can therefore digest its food in only four hours (half the time a cow takes), which gives their body little time to remove the toxins from the food that they have eaten. To help in the digestion of its filthy food they have over a dozen parasites within them—some so small that they are only visible by a microscope. And since they cannot sweat or perspire, most of their toxins remain in their body. However, to help eliminate these poisons and filth, God created the pig with a canal running down each leg with an outlet at the bottom of each foot. Out of these openings, pus is eliminated (Pork trotters, anyone?) Occasionally one of these holes gets stopped up—usually with mud. When this potentially fatal situation occurs, the veter-

Supplementary material

DID CHRIST CLEANSE UNCLEAN ANIMALS OR UNCLEAN MEN?

by Sheldon Emry- 4 messages on 2 tapes
Peter's famous vision of the sheet is often misinterpreted to mean Christ was abolishing the laws regarding unclean meats. This tape series analyzes that passage in its intended context. It will shock some of you.

A-8126 and A-8127

2 tapes for \$10 posted



inarian has to quickly clean out the blocked hole with a pipe cleaner. If the vet is successful, then a powerful stream of awful smelling ooze pours out.

Because of its function as the “garbage man of the farm,” the meat of the pig [hot dogs, ham, bacon, sausage, pork chops, etc.] is 3000% more toxic than beef or venison. In addition, it carries over two-dozen diseases, which can be easily transmitted to people. With all of the filth, toxins, worms, pus, urine, and parasites that are present in the pig’s body and the extremely high fat content of its meat (twice as much as beef), then it makes sense why God warned His people to “*not eat of the swine’s flesh, nor touch their dead carcass*” (Lev. 11:7,8, and Deut. 14:8).

In addition, Isaiah the prophet instructed Israel on how angry God got with their rebellious behaviour. Notice what made Him so angry:

“I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, that walketh in a way that was not good, after their own thoughts; a people that provoketh me to anger continually to my face; that sacrificeth in gardens, ... that EAT SWINE’S FLESH, AND BROTH OF ABOMINABLE THINGS IS IN THEIR VESSELS” Isaiah 65:2-4).

GOD’S HEALTH PROMISES TO HIS PEOPLE

God repeatedly promised His people that if they would hearken unto His voice, and “*do that which is right in His sight, and will give ear to His commandments, and keep all His statutes*” that He would not put any of these diseases that He had put upon the Egyptians (Exodus 15:26); “*And the LORD will take away from thee ALL SICKNESS, and will put none of the evil diseases of Egypt, which thou knowest, upon thee, but will lay them upon all those who hate thee*” (Deuteronomy 7:15).

This included not only the “shall nots” of the Ten Commandments, but also the “shall nots” of the food laws! So, if the dietary food laws were changed, then so must the conditions for Israel’s blessing and cursing in relation to diseases also be changed. For if eating unclean foods, such as the swine, caused disease in the Old Testament days, then if the swine and other unclean animals were truly cleansed, then they would no longer be harmful to the health of God’s people—but they are!

Those to whom this promise of good health was **exclusively** given (the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic-Germanic and Scandinavian and kindred people) now not only ignore it but are the largest consumers of unclean foods in the world—ham, catfish, lobsters, clams, rabbits, bacon, spareribs, oysters, pork chops, hot dogs, etc. Are the Israel nations healthy or sickly?

And who keeps these food restrictions?—the descendants of the seller of his birthright—the Edomites and the descendants of the one who was denied Abraham’s inheritance—the Ishmaelites.

THE SYMBOLIC INTERPRETATION:

This view promotes the idea that the unclean animals in Peter’s sheet were symbolic of peoples of all races. The following is the note on Acts 10:11 given in the popular Scofield Bible:

“Although this vision is admittedly symbolic, Peter’s experience recorded here was a definite revelation to him that God had made a major change in his dealings with mankind (v.28). Peter demurred at God’s command (v.14),

but the Spirit of God was insistent that he should adjust his thinking and action to this change...” (Scofield Bible).

What was this **major change** that had occurred? If it were not unclean animals transformed into clean, then what or who were the recipients of God’s cleansing? A careful reading of the story provides some clues.

The text in Acts 10 indicates that God wanted Peter to go with three men who had been sent from Cornelius’ house in the nearby town of Caesarea. Why did Peter need a vision to convince him to visit and preach at this military officer’s house? Because previous to this time it was unlawful for Peter or any other circumcised Israelite to do so!

The Apostle told Cornelius and his kin shortly after he arrived “*Ye know that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation; ..*” Acts 10:28a). And later when Peter went “*to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them*” (Acts 11:2b,3). This area of contention was a difficult problem for many to overcome—because of the peer pressure from the leaders at the Jerusalem church. Even Peter succumbed to this pressure when he “flip-flopped” his position while dining with the church members in Galatia. As a consequence, the Apostle Paul rebuked him for his hypocritical behaviour (Galatians 2:11-14).

Circumcised Israelites of Judea eating with uncircumcised “gentiles” was a major problem in the early church. Likewise, when the news spread that the Holy Spirit had been granted to them and many of them had accepted the gospel and were baptized it caused a great stir and much questioning. So much so that a

special council was held at Jerusalem (Acts 15).

At that session, Peter retold the story of his vision of the sheet and what happened at Cornelius’ house. Peter told them what the Holy Spirit had clearly instructed him: “*Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles (nations) by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, who knoweth the hearts, bore them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying (same word as “cleansed” in Acts 10:15) their hearts by faith*” (Acts 15:7-9).

Quoting from the Scofield Bible note on Acts 10:11; “The beasts (‘unclean’ according to the law) and Jews (ceremonially ‘clean’). They were present in the same vessel (or sail) let down from heaven (cp. Jn. 17:18), declared cleansed by God (vv. 15, 34-45), and then caught up to heaven (v.16). The revelation of the Church was not given alone to Paul. Paul himself says that it was revealed unto God’s ‘holy apostles and [N.T.] prophets [both words plural] by the Spirit’ (Eph 3:5). This revelation to Peter, reported to Gentiles at Caesarea (Acts 10:24-29) and Jews at Jerusalem (Acts 11:1-11), plainly teaches that God is calling out both Gentiles and Jews to Himself in this age (Eph 2:11-22). This was Peter’s own evaluation of what God did through him at Caesarea (Acts 15:7-11, 14; see Jn. 14:20, note).”

The Scofield notes are representative of the commonly



accepted view in our time. Universalists of all denominations use the account of Peter's sheet vision to suggest that the unclean animals in the sheet represent Gentiles, who they say, are peoples of all races.

But this would be catastrophic! It would make most of the Old Testament meaningless. (Maybe that is one reason the Gideon Bible Association passes out partial Bibles: New Testament portion only). Wrongly changing the heirs of the everlasting covenant is a much more serious felony than the changing of a few dietary regulations.

Besides, if this viewpoint were correct, that is, if "Gentiles" means peoples of all races, then there would be many unexplainable theological consequences;

(1) It would nullify the unconditional covenant that God made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and their seed.

(2) It would do the impossible—make God a liar.

(3) The elect of God in the Old Testament would be totally different from the elect of God in the New Testament.

(4) Many of God's laws of holiness and separation would be violated.

(5) Many of the promises and prophecies would be nullified or broken.

(6) God's sworn oath would be broken.

(7) The recipients of God's everlasting covenant would be changed.

(8) That status of God's elect people would be in a chaotic, insecure position.

(9) The enemies of God could become His children (Vipers could become sheep).

(10) God would have failed to keep His unconditional covenant with His chosen people.

Why would something of such gigantic magnitude be ignored in the teachings of Jesus? Why would such a drastic, promise-breaking change be taught to just a single apostle in a perplexing vision in a far away town? Thank God, it wasn't. Besides, Peter's vision could not have taught that individuals of all races could become sons of the covenant—because Cornelius and his men were NOT OF A DIFFERENT RACE than Peter! Therefore, this popular, politically correct, universalistic symbolic interpretation does not even make any sense!

THE BIBLICAL MEANING

The New Testament is a continuation of the Old Testament. The elect of God are the same people in both. The cursed seed are the same people in both. The story of the covenant people's redemption, establishment into a kingdom, apostasy, captivity, and reconciliation, are consistent throughout the entire Bible. The Paradise of God in the midst of the Garden of Eden in Genesis is seen again in the final chapter of Revelation.

The biblical fact that the Kingdom of God, the physical seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were eventually divided into two separate kingdoms with different destinies is of no theological importance to the majority of Christians of today. The Birthright Kingdom (Northern Kingdom of Israel) and the Scepter Kingdom (Southern Kingdom of Judah) were rent asunder shortly after the death of King Solomon. But the larger Northern Kingdom ceased to be a kingdom in the days of King Hezekiah of Judah. Taken into captivity by the Syrians and Assyrians they were separated from the commonwealth of Israel and became defiled and unclean. They were uncircumcised Israelites scattered in the dispersion from the British Isles to India

This unclean condition of the uncircumcised Israelite

nations of the former Northern Kingdom lasted almost a thousand years. But the prophets had prophesied that God would save them from all their uncleanness (Ezekiel 36:29a). God's prophets repeatedly proclaimed that God would put His Spirit in them (Ezekiel 37:14), and that He would "CLEANSE THEM" (Ezekiel 37:23b).

Historically and biblically, the House of Israel, after they apostatized and were scattered among the nations were considered **unclean or common** by those practicing Hebraism of the Old Covenant in the Southern Kingdom of Judah. And no wonder. They were separated from the commonwealth of Israel in an uncircumcised, defiled and unclean condition for centuries.

But this unclean condition of the Israelites of the former Northern Kingdom was a fulfillment of the direct prophecy of the prophet Hosea (see Hosea, chapter one). But it had also been prophesied [by Hosea, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and others] that this particular situation of the Israelites would not be a PERMANENT one. A new covenant would be made with them and their brethren of the Southern Kingdom (Jeremiah 31:31). This reconciliation, however, was a great mystery (Ephesians 3:4-6). After all, they would be in this condition for over 700 years!

So, the Bible says nothing about unclean animals being cleansed. The Bible says nothing about Aborigines and other non-covenant peoples being cleansed. But the Bible does say a lot about unclean Israelite nations being cleansed. Therefore, the only possible interpretation of Peter's Vision Sheet is

the latter: The unclean animals in the sheet were symbolic of the **dispersed, defiled, and unclean House of Israel**.

The death, burial, resurrection and ascension of Jesus the Christ paved the way for the confirming of the covenant that was made with the patriarchal fathers of these uncircumcised Israelites. These millions of unclean descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, known as "*Gentiles in the flesh*" (Ephesians 2:11) were NOW in Jesus "*made near by the blood of Christ*" (Eph 2:13).

The fact that "Gentiles" mostly referred to dispersed Israelites can be easily seen in the New Testament book of First Corinthians. In chapter 10, the Apostle Paul identifies these uncircumcised Greeks as being descendants of the Israelites who were delivered from Egypt by Moses. While in chapter 12, verse 2, he writes: "*Ye know that ye were Gentiles*"

Peter does the same thing. In one place he refers to Cornelius and his men as "*children of Israel*" (Acts 10:36) and in other places he calls them "Gentiles"—(Acts 15:12). Thus, when Peter explained to Cornelius that it was unlawful for him "*to keep company or come unto one of another nation*" (Acts 10:28a)—the word "another" in "another nation" according to W.E. Vine in his book, *An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words With Their Precise Meanings for English Readers* "denotes another of the SAME SORT." Both Peter and Cornelius were "of the same sort"—that is, they were both Israelites—but of different kingdoms.

PETER'S SERMON AT CORNELIUS' HOUSE

Peter's sermon at Cornelius' house began, "*Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him*" (Acts 10:34, 35). The "in every nation" is commonly and incorrectly given the general meaning of every being every race. But Cornelius was one of those who feared and believed God. He had that spiritual capac-

haven't seen it before? Get it NOW!
HIJACKING CATASTROPHE
9-11, Fear & the Selling of American
Empire
"weapons of mass destruction" we were all
wrong.
#CI-396 DVD only \$15



ity within him from his conception. He and the others of his house had the capacity to believe God and so could accept the gospel of the Kingdom and be reinstated as God's people. Peter preached in Cornelius' house that, "To Him [Jesus] give all the PROPHETS witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins" (Acts 10:43).

The prophets did not witness or prophesy of redemption and remission of sins for all races. Evidently it is thought that they should have, according to the common popular doctrine. The prophets were giving witness about Jesus and Israel as they only traveled to those areas of the earth where the scattered Israelites had migrated. This all fits together as Peter continued his sermon: "The word which God sent unto the CHILDREN OF ISRAEL, preaching peace by Jesus (the) Christ" (Acts 10:36).

Peter continues by saying that a start was made in the Holy Land and continued to the uncircumcised Grecians of the House of Israel (Acts 10:37, 11:20). This fulfilled the Word as being sent to all Israel [both Kingdoms], both circumcised and uncircumcised. Thus, the "every nation" in verse 35 is explained in the next verse as being every nation of the nations of Israel! [the former tribes of Israel that developed into many nations after they had been dispersed into many lands via the Syrian, Assyrian and Babylonian captivities].

The Apostle Paul in his epistle to the dispersed Israelites at Ephesus reiterated what was shown Peter in his vision. The mystery was revealed to Peter by the Holy Spirit's explanation of that vision that was shown him three times. The Apostle Paul's knowledge of this mystery was revealed to him by the Holy Spirit in a different manner (Galatians, chapter one).

And the rest of the Apostles also were given the solution to this mystery—but exactly when and how we are not informed. But this mystery (not of a changing menu, but of the confirming of the Abrahamic Covenant to the children of that covenant by the blood of Jesus Christ—was not previously made known unto the sons of men, "as it is NOW revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit [didn't the Spirit explain the vision to Peter]: That the Gentiles [uncircumcised Israelite nations] should be fellow heirs [with the circumcised Israelite nations] and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel" (Eph 3:5b and 6).

CONCLUSION

Peter's Sheet Vision was given at lunchtime when the missionary Apostle was hungry. But the animals shown on the sheet had nothing to do with what animals and fowl he was now allowed to eat. The vision was used symbolically to instruct him to go with the three men who were about to knock on the door of the house where he was staying. At first, Peter did NOT understand the meaning of the vision, even though it was presented to him three times. But after God's Spirit revealed to Peter that God has cleansed his brethren of the former Northern Kingdom, he did not hesitate to preach to them. God had not cast away his people: The covenant was kept.

Just as the prophets of Israel had proclaimed over and over: the dispersion and punishment of the apostate Israel-

ites would not last forever. There was coming a time when those defiled rejectors of God's Covenant would be cleansed and restored (example: Ezekiel 37:23: "...But I [God] will save them out of all their dwelling places, in which they have sinned, and I WILL CLEANSE THEM ..."). And there was coming a time when God's Spirit would be placed in them after a long time of being cut off (example: Ezekiel 37:14: "And shall put my [God's] Spirit in you ... then shall ye know that I, the LORD, have spoken it, and performed it, saith the LORD").

Thus, the Apostle Peter was a first hand witness of the fulfillment of the giving of holy spirit to formerly unclean Israelites: "And as I [Peter] began to speak, holy spirit fell on them [those of Cornelius' house], as on us at the beginning" [those who experienced Pentecost at the Temple courtyard—Acts 2] (Acts 11:15). It took a vision repeated three times with the interpretation given by God's spirit to overcome over seven hundred years of enmity and separation.

God worked at both ends of the story told in Acts 10 and 11: Cornelius and his men at Joppa; Peter and his disciples at Caesarea. It had nothing to do with what was to be served for lunch or dinner, it

had nothing to do with other races (Cornelius was not a negro or Asiatic or a Edomite)—he and his men were "lost sheep of THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL." It had to do with the reconciliation of the House of Israel and the House of Judah with each other and the reconciliation of them to their God.

There is no biblical or scientific proof that a pig is any different biologically today than it was prior to Peter's vision. There is no biblical or historical proof that the covenant that God made unconditionally and exclusively with Jacob's seed has been altered or annulled. But there is an abundance of biblical and his-

torical proof that the nations of unclean Israel have become the "cleansed" Christian nations of the world. Peter's Sheet Vision was the signal of the amazing grace that was about to be shed on the dried dead bones of the unclean House of Israel.

"Who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify ["cleanse"] unto himself a people of his own, zealous of good works"—Titus 2:14.

Courtesy The New Covenant Messenger, PO Box 321 Union KY 41091

LET GO AND LET GOD by Eleanor Russell

Mr. Editor, [of TKC] I read your article about the difficulty of getting people to accept and believe our Israel message - and your SOS for people to say why we are failing in reaching people.

First of all, those against us are mightier than those who are for us (in human terms). The people with all the money have all the power at present—and that is because of the blessing that Isaac gave to Esau, after Jacob stole the blessing that belonged to the elder son. Ever since, Esau has been trying to get it back. Isaac, in his [secondary] blessing to Esau said, "And when you shall have the dominion (over Jacob) thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck." (Gen 27:40) That [Dominion] has happened and



with the radio, television and all the newspapers spouting their own propaganda of lies—they will continue to do so.

But do not forget what Esdras in the Apocrypha has to say — “*Esau is the end of the Age and Jacob is the beginning of that which follows.*” We have come to the end of the Age of Grace. Now we must have patience to watch for God’s timing as to the beginning of the Kingdom Age.

I am sympathetic to all those who want things to happen, and are tired of waiting. I feel exactly that way myself. Yet, we must keep reminding ourselves that God has given us the phrase, “**WAIT upon the Lord,**” if we want things to go the way God has planned. His plan for us is perfect, but he needs our obedience to His will, and not our interference in taking the ‘planning’ on ourselves. By doing so, we only get in God’s way.

Sarah comes very strongly to mind when she couldn’t wait for God’s promise of a son for her and Abraham. Yet, God had an appointed time for Isaac to be born, and nothing interfered with that. The Celto-Saxon people are all the better for it and greatly blessed now, though under the penalties that God said would fall upon those who would not follow His perfect laws. What we need to remember is the fact that in God’s time His blessings upon our people will be abundant, and if we wait for the harvest of blessings to come, our joy will be greater than the train of the waiting time we are experiencing now.

You write: “Remember, being Christians, as well as awakened Israelites, places upon our shoulders a greater responsibility than those who have not been awakened.” That is perfectly true, but God gave us the responsibility of being “*His witnesses, that I am God.*”

When I first believed the message over 60 years ago, I was sure it was too good to be true, but kept reading and studying, and made a nuisance of myself by trying to force people to believe, doing them and myself a great deal of harm. God, I believe has given me a longer life so that although it kills me, I try not to force His Word on anyone anymore! “*Wait on the Lord: be of good courage, and he shall strengthen thine heart: wait, I say, on the Lord.*” (Psalm 27:14).

Wait for the Lord to show us his first move. He who will open the way to witnessing for Him, and showing others the truth that we ourselves are unable to provide at present. God will soon make a move to show that all the years we have been faithful in speaking His Word, even though people now laugh about it, God will give us the last Word; and give to His witnesses the joy of watching Him change the world, to witness freely to those who, to the present day, have no real interest in sacred matters.

Let us present our supplications to God, asking for patience to wait for Him to move, and keep on with the things that we know He is putting in our hearts and minds as we strive to serve Him.

Above all, may we obey His commandments, and ask Him to help us in our endeavours to do so. For if we, His little flock, persist in doing those things that are harmful to others, how can we expect Him to answer our prayers? Forget about winning people. First do what God expects of us, and that is, blessing the people you are brought face to face with in this walk through life. If you are truly trying to bless others, then do it because you love God and not for any superficial gain, such as worldly folk do today. Years ago, the BIWF published a one-page tract entitled: “Let go and let God.” Sixty years ago I was not sure what it meant, now I think I do!

When we are discouraged with our slow progress in seeing people come and believe our message, let go and let God! Say what you feel that God would have you say. Then leave the problem in God’s hands. He can handle it better than we can, if we will only let Him.

We know that there are very hard times ahead of us - but beyond all the trouble to come, the time of Jacob’s trouble—the Apostle Paul says it well. “*For the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared to the glory which shall be revealed in us.*” (Romans 8:18).

Those are not idle words. They mean exactly what they say. There will be no glory ahead of us if we do not accept the sufferings which lie ahead. But he is comfort for you! - “*Fear thou not; for I am with thee: be not dismayed; for I am thy God; I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness.*” (Isaiah 41:10).

Courtesy Thy Kingdom Come, PO Box 1478 Ferndale WA 98248



ANSWERING THE OBJECTIONS

People often provide supposed examples of race-mixing in the Bible in an effort to counter the Scriptures’ prohibitions against miscegenation. Moses and Zipporah, Moses and Adoniah, Joseph and Asenath, Salmon and Rahab, and Boaz and Ruth are often exploited as biblically sanctioned precedents for interracial relationships. However, none of these instances represent race-mixing for the simple reason that race-mixing requires two races, and in each of these instances the husband and wife were of the same race.

Moses and Zipporah

“... a man of the house of Levi ... took to wife a daughter of Levi. And the woman conceived and bare a son ... And she [Pharaoh’s daughter] called his name Moses...” (Exod. 2:1-10).

“Now the priest of Midian ... gave Moses Zipporah his daughter.” (Exod. 2:16-21).

There is only one race represented in the marriage of Moses and Zipporah. Moses was a descendant of Abraham, an Israelite from the tribe of Levi. Zipporah was a Midianite, and the Midianites were descended from Abraham through his wife Keturah’s fourth son Midian:

“Then again Abraham took a wife, and her name was Keturah. And she bare him ... Midian...” (Gen. 25:1-2).

Moses and Adoniah

“And Miriam and Aaron spoke against Moses because of the Ethiopian woman [Adoniah] whom he had married ...” (Numbers 12:1)

Today, an ethnic Ethiopian would not be of the same race as an Israelite. However, Ethiopian, as it has been rendered in the KJV, is a poor translation of the Hebrew word *Kuwshiy*, Strong’s Concordance defines *Kuwshiy*:

“... patronymically from OT:3568; a Cushite, or descendant of Cush.”

The Cushites were descendants of Cush, Noah’s grandson by Ham:

“And the sons of Ham: Cush, and Mizraim, and Phut, and Canaan.” (Gen 10:6)

Cush’s father Ham was a brother of Noah’s firstborn son Shem who was a progenitor of the Israelites. Therefore, Ham’s descendants through Cush were of the same race as were Shem’s Israelite descendants through Abraham and Jacob. Even if Adoniah had been a racial Cushite, she would have been of the same race as Moses.

Although not a part of the canonized Scripture, the *Book of Jasher* (cited in Joshua 10:13 and 2 Samuel 1:18, and referenced in 2 Tim. 3:8)[# 314 @ #21.00ppd] provides pertinent information concerning Adoniah’s and Moses’ relationship with her during his exile from Egypt and after he had delivered her people from the children of



Aram:

"... they [the Cushites] gave him [Moses] for a wife Adoniah the Cushite queen, wife of Kikianus [deceased king of the Cushites]. And Moses feared the Lord God of his fathers, so that he came not to her, nor did he turn eyes to her. For Moses remembered how Abraham had made his servant Eliezer to swear, saying unto him, Thou shalt not take a woman from the daughters of Canaan [brother of Cush] for my son Isaac. Also what Isaac did when Jacob had fled from his brother, when he commanded him, saying, Thou shalt not take a wife from the daughters of Canaan ..."

Apparently Adoniah was of Canaanite descent and a Cushite by citizenship. Although Moses accepted her as a gift from the Cushites, he never cohabited with her, knowing that by Yahweh's law he was forbidden to do so. The Hebrew word *laqach*, translated marriage in Numbers 21:1, simply means took and does not necessarily imply marriage.

Joseph and Asenath

"And Pharaoh called Joseph's name Zaphnath-paaneah; and gave him to wife Asenath the daughter of Poti-pherah priest of On ..." (Gen 41:45).

Joseph was an Israelite and Asenath is identified in the book of Exodus as an Egyptian. The book of Psalms affirms that the Egyptians of that day were Hamites:

"He [Yahweh] ... smote all the firstborn in Egypt, the chief of their strength in the tabernacles of Ham." (Psalm 78:50-51). "Israel also came into Egypt, and Jacob sojourned in the land of Ham ... They shewed his signs among them, and wonders in the land of Ham" (Psalm 105:23-27). "...God ... had done great things in Egypt, wondrous works in the land of Ham, and terrible things by the Red Sea" (Psalm 106:21-22).

Joseph was an Israelite, and the Israelites were descendants of Shem, the first-born son of Noah. Asenath was a Hamite, and the Hamites were descendants of Ham, the second-born son of Noah. Only one race was represented in Joseph's marriage to Asenath, which precludes any race-mixing in their marriage.

Salmon and Rahab

"And Salmon begat Booz [Boaz] of Rachab [Rahab]..." (Matthew 1:5)

Salmon was a Judahite, and Rahab is often alleged to be a Canaanite. However, even if Rahab were a racial Canaanite there would not be two races represented in Salmon's marriage to Rahab. As already established, the Canaanites, although a forbidden lineage, were descendants of Ham, the brother of Shem and progenitor of the Israelites. Therefore, there was only one race represented in this relationship. It is, nonetheless, untenable that Yahshua would have been born of a forbidden lineage.

"When Yahweh thy God shall bring thee into the land whither thou goest to possess it, and hath cast out many nations before thee, the Hittites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jubusites ... thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor shew mercy unto them: Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son" (Deut 7:1-3). [note: this whole question of Rahab, may not even be relevant, as one Bible chronology places the entry into Canaan {and Rahab the 'harlot'} about 150 years ahead of Salmon's and Rahab's begetting Boaz. It could easily be another person with the same name! CIM]

The seven nations listed in Deuteronomy 7 were all descendants of Canaan who were forbidden to Israel for marriage. There is no reason to conclude that Yahshua was born of a forbidden lineage because Rahab is never identified as a Canaanite in the Bible. Although Rahab lived in the Canaanite city of Jericho, it is speculation to identify her as a racial Canaanite from this fact alone. As an example, Moses, who was unquestionably an Israelite, was identified as an Egyptian after departing from Egypt:

"And when they [the daughters of Reuel] came to Reuel their father, he said, How is it that ye are come so soon today? And they said, **An Egyptian delivered us out of the hand of the shepherds...**" (Ex. 2:18-19).

Moses was known as an Egyptian - not because he came from the loins of the Egyptians, but because he came from the land of Egypt. If Rahab were a Canaanite, Yahshua, being a descendant of Rahab, could not legitimately sit on the throne. The Law of yahweh demands that no one but an Israelite is to rule over Israelites

"Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom Yahweh thy God shall choose: one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother." (Deut 17:15).

Yahshua came from Judah, not Canaan, to rule over His people Israel.

"And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among the princes of Judah: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel" (Matthew 2:60).

Rahab is listed in the book of Hebrews, in the Hebrew and Israelite faith hall of fame - Hebrews 11:31. Rahab, therefore, must have been a Hebrew or an Israelite who resided in Jericho, perhaps a slave or a descendant of a slave. This could perhaps explain why the two Israelite spies sought her out and also why the king of Jericho went to her looking for the two spies in Joshua 2:1-3. (Or it was another person at a different time with the same name).

For the principle point under discussion, it does not make any difference whether Rahab was an Israelite or a Canaanite. Either way she was of the same race as Salmon her husband and therefore their marriage was not interracial.to be continued. - Boaz and Ruth-15

HOMESCHOOLING SAVES YOUR CHILD FROM DESTRUCTION

by Joel Turtel (Jan 21, 2006) NewsWithViews.com

Home schooling removes children from public school. That alone makes home schooling worthwhile. Unlike public-school children, home-schooled kids are not prisoners of a system that can wreck their self-esteem, ability to read, and love of learning. Home-schooled kids don't have to read dumbed-down textbooks, study subjects they hate, or endure meaningless classes six to eight hours a day.

Home-schooled kids won't be subject to drugs, bullies, violence, or peer pressure, as they are in public schools. Home-schooled children who are "different" in any way won't have to endure cruel jokes and taunts from other children in their classes.

Slow-learning or "special needs" children won't be humiliated by their peers if they are put in regular classes, or further humiliated if the teacher puts them in so-called special education classes. Faster learning home-schooled kids won't have to sit through mind-numbing classes that are geared to the slowest learning students in a class. They



won't have to "learn" in cooperative groups where other kids in the group do nothing and are not cooperative.

Home-schooled children do not have to waste their time memorizing meaningless facts about subjects that bore them, just so they can pass the next dumbed-down test to obey and please school authorities. Home-schooled kids don't have to endure twelve years of a third-rate, public-school education that leaves many students barely able to read their own diplomas. The notion that tests tell teachers and parents what children have learned turns out to be false. John Holt, teacher and author of *How Children Fail*, pointed out that most children soon forget what they memorized for a test as soon as the test is over, so the entire test-taking process is usually worthless. Facts or ideas that are not useful or relevant to children pass through them like a sieve and are soon forgotten.

Home-schooled kids don't have to study an arbitrary meaningless curriculum of subjects imposed on them by programmed public-school authorities. They don't have to be treated like mindless, spiritless robots that have to learn the same subjects at the same time and in the same sequence as their classmates.

Home-schooled children don't have to sit quietly in a class of twenty-five other students and pretend they like being in this mini-prison called public school, just to avoid being punished by a teacher for "acting-out" or fidgeting in their seats. Any adult's mind would wander if they were forced to sit through a boring lecture for just one hour. Yet public schools expect children to sit still for boring lectures on subjects that are meaningless to them, for six to eight hours a day.

Home-schooled children do not have to be fearful of displeasing a teacher because they get the wrong answers on meaningless tests. Therefore they do not have to be fearful of learning and have their natural joy in learning crippled as a result of this fear. Infants and very young children embrace life and learning with a passion, which is why they learn so fast. Yet, as John Holt found out, by the time these same children have progressed to the fifth grade in school, most are listless, bored, apathetic, and often fearful in class.

Home-schooled children won't be terrorized by test grades and comparisons to their classmates, and associate learning with this terror. They won't associate learning with always having to get the "right answer" that school authorities insist on. They won't be made to feel that learning means passing an arbitrary test, and that failing a test is a shame or disgrace. Home-schooling also gives parents control over the values their kids learn. It prevents school authorities from indoctrinating their children with warped values Pagan religions, or politically correct ideas.

Unlike public-school students, home-schooled children are not forced to sit through explicit or shocking sex-education classes. School authorities can't pressure home-schooling parents or children to take mind-altering drugs like Ritalin. So keeping a child out of public school is an enormous benefit in itself. Other positive benefits of home-schooling are:

1). Home-schooling lets parents give children a custom-made curriculum that makes learning a joy. Parents can expose their children to many different subjects and ultimately focus on subjects that their children enjoy and benefit from. Children can also learn about subjects that are not taught in any school, and have time for non-academic subjects like **art** and **music**. Parents can choose from a wide range of teaching materials that not only engage and delight their kids, but bring real results.

2). Home-schooled children can learn at their own pace. Slower learning kids will benefit by their parent's love and attention. Bright children will progress as fast as they want to. Children will learn to read or learn any other subject when they are ready, not according to a prescribed timetable. Unlike public schools, home-schooling parents treat each child as a unique individual with his or her own special interests, talents, strengths and weaknesses. Parents can also tailor-make the instruction to each child's personality and learning style.

3). Home-schooling parents can give their kids a one-to-one teacher-student ratio. This insures that children get individualized attention from a loving, attentive parent-teacher.

4). Home-schooled kids get instant feedback. Children don't have to compete with twenty other children in a class for their teacher's attention. A parent-teacher can instantly answer her child's questions, or research the answer together with her child.

(website: mykidsdeservebetter.com)

**WORKING CHARACTER INTO
YOUR CHILDREN**
by Michael Pearl

"All work is pain," said a French philosopher. You don't have to be smart to know that. I could have uttered such words of wisdom when I was five years old. The older I get the truer it becomes. We live in a plain community made up of Amish and Mennonite farmers and laborers. They can work circles

around me. I can't even keep up with the children and old ladies, but I have never heard any of them complain when the work is finished and the dinner bell rings. Even their horses and mules despise work. If you give a horse a choice, he would never work, and when you accidentally point him toward the barn, he will stubbornly pull at the bit, trying to get back to his quiet, comfortable stall. However, in this community the horses, mules, children, adults and even crickety old grandmas perform their necessary labor.

Both of our sons are construction contractors, as well as most of the men in the church. Nearly all the young men in the community are raised working with their fathers or with other men in the area. It is a culture of hard work, and a man who won't work receives about as much respect as a thief.

From time to time, new people move into the community. We have seen young teenagers come along and begin to work with the men. There is a marked difference between someone who is raised working and someone who didn't work until he got to his teen years. The newcomer to work may learn to put in his time and even earn his wages, but he will never be committed to work like the ones raised

New Tapes:

#E-124 The World Not Chosen (DB32)

#E-125 Clean, Unclean or Defiled (DB33)

#E-126 America's Turning Point #1

#E-127 Cincinnati Connection - TP#2

pastor Don Elmore

#G-555 Principles of Biblical Economics 15

#G-556 Principles of Biblical Economics 16

#G-557 Principles of Biblical Economics 17

evangelist Ted R. Weiland

#J-126 The Christian & Civil Government 4

#J-127 The Death of Private De Jobe

pastor John Weaver

#K-483 Who are Ephraim & Manasseh

Today? 1 Joseph series #19

#K-484 Who are Ephraim & Manasseh? 2

**#K-485 The Scepter Shall Not Depart from
Judah 1, Joseph series 21**

**#K-486 The Scepter Shall Not Depart from
Judah 2, Joseph series 22. James Bruggeman**



working.

Now you may say, "But I don't intend for my child to have to work with his hands; I want him to be a professional." Children gain more from labor than muscles and money. I have noticed an interesting connection. The young men and women who learn to bear the yoke in their youth develop an area of character that is purer and more honest than those who don't learn to work early. It is almost as if those who never learned to work are always weak in resolve and commitment. When it comes time to sweat or bend their backs, they become men-pleasers, working with eye-service. They remind me of a fat person who sneaks around and lies about what he is eating. Lazy people feel the need to make a good show, but work is so distasteful that they are dishonest about it. These loafers are missing something in their character. There is an area of life that they avoid at all cost, and they are always the poorer in soul because of it. They are less likely to gain the respect of their fellow man—or their family, for that matter—and they are not as prone to become leaders. They are not as ready to endure hardship, including emotional and mental. All things being equal, they will flee from a marriage or job sooner than the ones who learned to bear up under work when young. They are less likely to sacrifice their comfort or rights for others. In short, the lazy child will grow up to be more selfish than the child who is taught to work.

The most obvious trait of the person raised to work is emotional stability. There is a calmness of soul and a confidence that accompanies the person who has persevered in the face of duty and suffered to the end of his days toil. He is less likely to be nervous and anxious. He finds a rest in his soul that the lazy loafer will never know. I believe that if you were to go to a hospital for the emotionally disturbed, you would find that a disproportionately high number of the patients were coddled and not taught to work when they were young. If you were to take a poll at the welfare lines or at the homeless shelters, you would find that the majority of them did not come from secure families where they were led to work as children.

Children who work, all things being equal, never have problems with poor self-image. It is the pampered, lazy child that commits suicide, gets on drugs, or turns to freaks for companionship. Working children don't poke their bodies full of holes and dye their hair blue. They do not feel the need to follow style. They know who they are, and they don't need a gang to give them identity. Furthermore, the working child and teenager is more prone to respect authority and less likely to demand his equal rights. He is more independent, and rather than expecting someone to give him his fair share, he expects to have to earn his way. This makes him a more productive member of society, and the discipline he develops when working will enable him to better succeed in academics or in the corporate world.

I have observed that ministers and missionaries who came from hard working background are more apt to respect the people to whom they minister. People who come from a working background are less likely to steal or cheat. To sum it all up, a balanced experience of work will instill integrity, a good attitude, diligence, and perseverance in a child.

Now, I have not taken a poll. I have no way of proving these things, but it is what I have observed in a half century of studying people. My conclusion is that no matter what

your child is going to do in life, whether a concert pianist, a politician, an attorney, a banker, or a missionary, the best preparation of character, mind, and body is to be engaged in Responsible and productive labor when young.

All of us can point to exceptions to the trend I have noted. You will remember that I qualified my conclusions with the statement "all things being equal." A child who is worked like a slave or one who is taught to work but is abused or neglected in some way, will not do so well. Likewise, there are those who did not work as children, but were vigorous and committed to personal goals, and, at the first opportunity, they did launch into work with a zeal equal to those who were brought up to work. Yes, there are definitely exceptions to the rule, and the exceptions may be many, but the rule—representing the majority—still applies. One could take a chance and hope his pampered child would somehow be one of the exceptions, but I would never take such a risk with a child in my care. They will learn to work at the same time they learn to play. My children did, and they all represent themselves well to this day.

The sum of the matter is that work is a necessary of life. It takes unpleasant work to provide the basic essentials of life for ourselves and for those for whom we are respon-

sible. We have a duty to work and to pull our share. To do one's duty is a moral obligation. When a child grows up slothful and dismissive toward his duty to work, it ingrains in him the concept of neglecting distasteful duty in general. The neglect of duty is shameful in any culture. The performance of duty is the measure of a man, or child. Shirking duty is the lowest form of social cowardliness. To shirk one's duty and still be received in society, one must manufacture the appearance that he has done his share. He must procrastinate, make excuses, lie, connive, and blame others. To

manipulate others into doing your duty is to place a low value on your honour and a lower value on the person forced to do your dirty work. It is pride.

A child who grows up facing up to his duty to work, grows into the concept of sacrificing for others and suffering for what is right, acting responsibly no matter how much it hurts, and paying the price to do what one ought to do. Everyone likes the person who is the first to step up to the work. It is a compliment to others and an act of humility to step forward and clean up after a party, to work in the parking lot at church, to replace the roof, to cut the grass, etc. A man that always has a slick way of bowing out is viewed with distrust and disgust. He appears selfish and always seems like an outsider and a user. When someone tells us a bad rumor about a hard worker, we are doubtful that it is true. We don't want it to be true. It doesn't fit what we know of his character. When the same rumor is told on one who shirks his duty with manufactured excuses, we think, "Well, I always knew there was something dishonest about him. He is just the kind of person who would do something like that."

To go through youth avoiding work is an indulgence in the art of deception and blame. To come to adulthood having neglected responsibility is to come with a character that is shadowed and devious. There is no better context in which to instill character in our children than in the performance of their duty.

Courtesy Home School Digest, PO Box 374, Covert MI 49043

IF YOU BELIEVE, WHY DON'T YOU LISTEN?

a few copies left - order NOW!
THE SIXTH LAW OF GOD
(Thou Shalt Not Commit Adultery)

by pastor V.S. Herrell

"... in The Truth Unveiled, these passages are translated as: 'You will not mongrelize.'" Etymological introduction, Lexical analysis of the Latin, Racism in classical times, 'Mamzir' and 'Mongrel' in the Bible, Errancy of the Masoretic

Text and the KJV. 100 pages

613 @ \$7.50 posted



by **Chuck Kuhler, B.S.s M.Th., pastor,**
Virginia Christian Israelites

There are more than 320,000 churches in America, and fully 85% of our population claim to be "Christian." You would think that with numbers like that, our slide into degeneracy would be headed in the opposite direction and our standards of life would be vastly improving. Obviously, something is amiss as all of the so-called Christians do not appear to be having any effect of value and consideration.

I am well aware of some translation error to be found in modern versions of the Bible, but I am not going to consider that point in this message. As a Pastor, I encounter all sorts of Christians with various levels of Scriptural understanding and comprehension. The one question that I often ask of everyone is: *"Do you believe that the Bible is the Word of God as written and preserved by divinely-inspired men?"*

Without any hesitation, most agree with my question in the affirmative manner. I then follow up with a second question which most often perplexes and confounds their smug and confident answer; *"If as you claim, the Bible is the Word of God .. why do you ignore and not heed His Word?"*

I have often stated that the answer to every problem in life can be found in the Bible. Very few, however, consult the Word of God in search of answers to the problems of life. This attitude is mainly responsible for the conditions that we find surrounding us today. It was not too many years ago that families read the Scriptures and were well versed in the contents. Now we have allowed the "entertainment" industry to amuse us with the garbage that they televise into our homes.

It surprises me that most people do not know the Ten Commandments and what they have to say, and where in the Scriptures they can be found. The Ten Commandments were given to Moses by God and I consider them to be "the Word of God" given to us so that we are aware of what our heavenly Father expects of us, and what we should be abiding by. Throughout the entire Bible (both Old Testament and New Testament) we are given instruction for conducting our lives by both the Father and Son, but yet, we never bother to consult these words.

This is not some Talmudist Hollywood production where the voice of God thunders from the heavens above. Our Father most often speaks in a quiet voice to the individual.

The Bible was not written for all peoples, despite what the churches may claim. It is written only for and to ISRAEL, and while some other peoples are referenced throughout, it is only when they come into contact with God's people. Any attempt to "graft" strangers (non-Israelites) into the promises of God will be of no avail, and man, despite his desire to create the masses, will succeed at nothing in this misguided effort. It is the fruit of modern churchianity who are attempting to promote their particular "brand" of what they consider Christianity. But modern-day, and so-called, "Christians" don't know enough to be able to refute these erroneous traditions, and they allow these misguided shepherds to lead them astray.

Let us consider a few examples from the commandments. Most of us know that we are told "not to murder" and "not to steal." But isn't the act of coveting a serious

consideration today. Also, we are told that we should not commit adultery, and if this is expected by God, why do so many marriages end in early divorce? The answer is that we are not listening to what our Maker has told us is expected of us, and we blissfully, and sinfully, proceed to go our way and not listen to what we are supposed to be doing. God has enumerated the commandments, statutes and judgments and we, for the most part, don't consider that this is God's Word.

I am of the belief that the end of this age is very close, although I would not attempt to select a date or time. How will you fare when time runs out? Will it find you blissfully unaware of what is transpiring? How much will these televised "situational reality programs" or programming like "American Idol" help you when you need to understand what is happening in a world crisis situation? God is not like a first-aid kit to sit on a shelf in the closet until you cut yourself. That type of understanding can be deadly to your future. Would you know what to do in an emergency?

How can you claim to be "a believer" and yet not listen to what our God is telling us? None of us are above sin, but we should be attempting to live our lives in accordance with what our Father expects. We all sin and fall far short of what is expected, but we do have the shed blood of Christ Jesus, which atones for our sins. This does not mean that we should not be concerned with the totality of our shortcomings, and yes, we are to strive to lead a sinless life even if we fall short.

There is today, a serious lack of belief due to disobedience and our lack of knowledge of what God wants of us. Will it improve? Unless we turn to the Word of God and accept it as such, and correct

our way of life, nothing will change.

If we as individuals can group together to form a band of committed Christian Israelites, then we can have a positive effect on that which is facing our nation and our people. We need to understand what "the Scriptures say," as this is what our God expects.

Despite what many individual Christians, and churches may be saying and claiming, I think that it is clearly evident that modern contemporary Christians are not "shaking the gates of hell," or putting any fear into the adversaries and their minions.

Courtesy Virginia Christian Israelites,

News For Your Health

BODY PIERCING AND PAINTING

There appears to be an epidemic of "body marking" and disfiguring traits being done by Christians. We have seen all manner of body piercing which appears to be nothing but disgusting in nature. It does not enhance the beauty (or masculinity) of the individual. I will not go into all of the body parts which have been subjected to this paganistic ritual, or the large number of women who proudly support some form of tattoo.

Check out your ancient history books folks, pierced ears and body parts are a sign of being a SLAVE. Just thought you'd like to know how the adversaries deceived us again into violating the laws of Yahweh where we are not to engage in piercing the body in any way.

Are you marked as a slave? Besides, when you do cut

still available; **WHO WAS THE TEMPTER OF THE HUMAN RACE?**

by John R. Fiske Jr.

This small booklet was reprinted by America's Promise after Sheldon Emry first read it. It is hoped the reader will be moved by the reading of this to make a further study on his own as to just what the Bible does and does not teach on satan, the devil or devils, the serpent, etc. We recognize that all of Mr. Fiske's arguments are not perfect, and we would guess that Mr. Fiske may have just begun to see the error of the common teaching on the "Devil," and in his attempt to show its error, he may have used some faulty reasoning. Therefore we do not agree with all his conclusions. But, a good starting point!

100 @ \$2.65 posted.



the body like this you are short circuiting your body's electrical system and a major place are the many meridian points on the ears.

Tattoos are also a practice of the pagans and Yahweh's people are forbidden to practice the ways of the pagans. Besides, the ink is very dangerous to the blood and liver functioning.

"My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge."

Courtesy Virginia Christian Israelites,

KEEP OR CHANGE?

Stephen Contrado, Th. M. 12 Park Ave. Hull, MA 02045

Keep or change differentiates every choice facing government and political parties confronted with questions of social policy. No state can both keep and change, for such a proposition is an inherent contradiction. Every citizen, therefore, must decide which side to take. Attempts to avoid the issue only produce illusions and delays in policy. The Bible's central thesis is that citizens of the Kingdom of God must keep God's commandments, statutes, and judgments and serve the Lord - those who do not are rebels. The prophet Isaiah gave a grim warning applicable to materialist America, saying, "*The nation (society) and kingdom (government) that will not serve the LORD shall perish; yea those nations shall be utterly wasted.*" (Isaiah 60:12). The increase in social misery, economic exploitation and international conflicts correlates with the nation's rebellion against God.

The ideology of the materialists supposes that citizens of a secular state should deny that a God created them and that they may set up their own social and political system. The atheistic values claim there is no divinely revealed truth. It regards man as an animal without a soul, using studies on primates to support its theoretical arguments on how man should live. Its pet term is "evolve." Thus the expectations of its institutional goals demand social change that manifests itself in divorcing society from any return to a past order. The lessons learned from dogs, monkeys, and rats become its radical philosophy. Change equates justice with revolution. It does not advocate rightful transition, and it slants terms, so that an intolerance against religious faith is considered tolerance and opposing a referendum to decide the validity of *gay marriage* is praised as democracy. It coats its poison with a sweet covering and calls it social justice. Old sins known to destroy civilizations become its new freedoms.

The ideology of the materialists revels in the creation of new phrases and psychobabble. The phrase universal kinship, for example, has no relation to Christian brotherly love, but supposes a future society of full sexual liberty where sex serves as a substitute for kinship. The ideology of the materialists permits individuals to shun personal responsibility. The youth who becomes a sodomite claims he is constitutionally homosexual and has a right to his natural life-style (Male rats overcrowded in cages with few females may make many same-sex contacts. But many parents still believe that indoctrination of children through schools and the media plays the chief role in popularizing sexual perversions).

Today people have a choice of relational sex or recreational sex. There is the freedom of pornography and wife-swapping for middle-aged couples in urban America. These liberals, opposing all forms of censorship and imagined repression, are trying to avoid proprietary notions of love and proprietary sexual attitudes. They consider themselves the vanguard in defusing dangerous fantasies about romantic love stemming from an authoritarian and paternalist society. Rebels against God? No! Just think of the revolutionary potential the ideology of the materialist

offers Americans for expressing their desires rather than devaluing them! It came as a surprise to many people that what they had cherished as natural physical relations were mere fictions embodied in the stereotypes of male and female sex roles. There is talk of a second adolescence-like identity crisis for modern man and modern woman when they reach their forties. Write a book to give this growing category of readers some guidance and make yourself a million bucks.

Birth control was once thought to bring sure victory to the sexual revolution, but the arrival of sexually transmitted diseases put a sure end to that fallacy. Abortion rights now claim to put men and women on an equal footing while advancing a zero-growth population that encourages ecology, longer life-spans and social harmony, but society is reeling under the influences of chronic diseases and addictions. The leaders of the materialist ideology show no understanding of human nature or history. They talk about social change as something that no one can prevent from taking place. They seek only to calm anxieties about the changes and to restrict opposition and backlash. They won when adultery was institutionalized in easy divorce laws. And when "gay" became another *normal* sexual orientation. The profound relation of the Bible to the laws of the land is the only relation they condemn as an illicit affair. Witchcraft, obscenity, outlandish tattoos, body piercing, freakish hairstyles and colours, and freakish clothing are fine in schools, but they prohibit a voiced prayer. They are quick to vilify the appearance of the Ten Commandments in public places.

Materialism has almost destroyed a free America and its intrinsic spiritual life. Christian America is witnessing a rebellion whose chief operatives are the most mercenary sort of people who have ever come into political power. We need the restoration of biblical law and a revival in faith to eliminate the atheist materialists from the land, so that we may keep those traditions which make this a great nation. Our enemies cannot hurt us if we keep our spiritual eyes open, keep on serving God, and keep evildoers at bay. Let us be sure to know the difference between keeping and changing. It is the difference between a culture of life and a culture of death.

Courtesy Virginia Christian Israelites PO Box 109 Round Hill VA 20142

NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTIANS

by *Chief* (from the internet)

I have heard the theology of "New Testament Christianity" for most of my life. I constantly hear folks, preachers, saying that the Old Testament dealt with the Jews and the Law, while the New Testament is primarily for the Gentiles and operates under Christ's Grace. Some say that the New Testament Church is not to be concerned with the Old Law, that it was abandoned at the Cross. They think, I suppose, that God's plan for Israel (they think all Israel were Jews) failed so He had to come up with a new plan, bringing the Gospel to the Gentiles who are the non-Jewish people (they think).

What is the New Testament? If one is going to talk about something, especially if they expect to teach others, they should know what the term means. The two books of the Bible that are commonly called the Old Testament and the New Testament should more properly be called the Old Scriptures and the New Scriptures. The Old Scriptures contain a number of different testaments. Again, what is a testament? What is a covenant? In every case in the New Scriptures both the word testament and the word covenant were translated from the same Greek word - *diatheke*. It is Strong's Greek word #1242 and it means a contract. Since



both these words mean a contract, what is a contract? A contract is an agreement between two or more parties that creates, modifies, or destroys a legal relationship. Any contract is binding on all parties, and each of them can legally force the other to perform according to the terms exactly as set forth.

A contract is an EXCLUSIVE document. In other words, if you are not named in it, you are not a party to it. Let's suppose that Junior Walkup had a cross-eyes mule with three white feet and Amos Moses decided he would like to buy said mule. They discuss the matter and agree upon a price. Amos pays Junior for the mule and they agree that Amos will come back with his truck the following day and pick up the mule. They have a contract. Junior is party of the First Part and Amos is Party of the Second Part. What if someone else comes by the following morning, loads up the mule, and leaves? What does this make the Third Party? It makes him a thief do course, since he has no part in this contract.

God made a covenant with the nation of Israel after brining them out of Egypt. He said, **IF** you will keep my Commandments, Statutes and Judgments I will do certain things **for** you, but **IF** you do not keep them I will do certain things **to** you. This was a contract between God, Party of the First Part and Israel, Party of the Second Part. It was a conditional contract since Israel had to do certain things to earn the blessing of God. Israel could not, and did not, live up to the agreement. God knew they could not and would not perform as required, and He said so at that time. This was all a part of the Master's plan in training and forming the people of Israel for what was planned for them in the latter days. Surely there is no doubt that this contract, or covenant, or testament, was made with Israel and no other people.

in Hebrews, chapter 8 and verse 8, we read, "*For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah...*" What? With whom? That can't be right: it's supposed to be with the Gentiles! That's what the Preacher said. Paul, here in Hebrews, is quoting Jeremiah 31:31 where the Lord is saying what He will do in the latter days. Since He finds fault with them (Israel), He says He will make a New Covenant with them (Israel).

What is the difference in the Old Covenant and the New Covenant? In the Old Covenant God wrote His Laws on stone and said IF you do this I will do this. In the New Covenant God says He will put His laws in their minds and write them in their hearts and, pay attention now, "*I WILL be to them a God, and they SHALL be to me a people.*" The New Covenant is not conditional. God says to Israel, I will and you shall. God has spoken and it is done. This New Covenant is with one people and only one people Israel! If you don't like that, take it up with God. Whether you like it or not, I would think it would be to everyone's advantage to at least try and determine who the modern day people of Israel are, and also where they are.

As I have already said, God is the Party of the First Part in this Covenant and Israel is the Party of the Second Part. Does your Bible say that the Party of the Second Part is the Gentiles, meaning some non-Israelite people? Is the party of the Second Part, either "all men" or "whosoever will"? NO, the EXCLUSIVE contract is made with only two entities - God and Israel - which is made up of the House of Israel and the House of Judah. Now the question to be resolved is this: *If you are not part of or the House of Judah, what right do you have to the New Testament contract?* Don't you see that if you're not one or the other of these entities, you have no right whatever? You are just like the person taking the cross-eyed mule with three white feet.

I don't care about your "extenuating circumstances." I am not interested in your humanist philosophy, posing as Christianity, that insinuates that Almighty God would not be either fair or loving if He made His contract only with the Israel people. Don't tell me about "spiritual Israel" because God's Word doesn't talk about any "spiritual Israel." The Word of God states that the New Testament is made with the same people with whom the Old Testament was made. We read: "*Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord.*" (Hebrews 8:9). Don't tell me about "grafted in" Gentiles being non-Israelites. Let me remind you that ONLY olive branches can be grafted onto olive trees.

Who, and where, is this Israel nation today? Let's see if we can figure it out. First of all, when did the New Testament contract go into effect? Some will say with Matthew ch 1:1. Here is what Paul has to say on the matter:

"...And for this cause He is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth."

So, the New Testament went into effect at the very instant that Jesus died on the Cross. At that instant, wherever the House of Israel and the House of Judah were located, they suddenly had the Law written in their minds and in their hearts. At that moment, Almighty God became a God to them again, and they became His people again. Wherever the Israel people were located, from that time on. Christianity began to grow. Why did this happen? It happened because God's Law became an intrinsic part of their minds and hearts. Yes, they were sinners, but the difference is that they knew they were doing wrong when they did it. Other peoples, as it is clear around the world, do not seem to have this internal guiding gift of the Law written in their inward parts.

There is a school of incorrect theology which teaches that the blessing of the New Testament are now applied only to the body of believers which they call "The Church." Yet, long after the Church had been established, Paul in Hebrews still goes right back and proclaims the New Testament on the two houses of Israel. The New Testament, if you study it closely, is a national and racial blessing. The main thing to resolve is which people are the inheritors of that blessing. (*New Testament Israel*, Sheldon Emry, # 225 @ \$1.95)

Who is it that, through their activities down through the last 2,000 years, seem to display that they have the Laws of God written in their minds and hearts? Who is it that just happens to have the natural propensity and the intrinsic desire to know and do the ways of God? Who seems to have the bells ringing in their gene memories such that when the Christian gospel is preached, they just naturally respond to it? As you look around the world for a great Christian testimony, do you find it in the Chinese people? No, they have their heathen religions, mostly Eastern cults based upon secular humanism, but it is not Christianity. How about the Negroes in Africa? No, their religions, and even the form of Christianity brought there by Christian missionaries, has yet to produce a single Christian nation in all of Africa, even after hundreds of years of trying by thousands of sincere Caucasian people.

How about the most obvious people, those who call themselves Jews and Israel? Can't you see that for 2,000



years they have never shown that the Law was written in their minds and hearts since the Cross? If there is any one thing consistent with the Jewish people over the centuries, it is that they have NEVER accepted the Christian message. On two different occasions in the book of Revelation, The Christ condemns those who say they are Jews (Judeans) and are not. As I have written many times, today's Jews have nothing to do with the House of Israel or the House of Judah and they know it. They demonstrate no evidence at any time of God's Laws being written in their minds and hearts, If not now, when? (*The Saved vs The Man of Sin*, Sheldon Emry, #A-7702 and A-7703, 2 tapes \$10 posted)

To preach and teach that the antichrist Jews are of the House of Judah or the House of Israel is to actually deny the intended effect of The Christ's death on the Cross. To teach that the Jews are descended from ancient Jacob-Israel may be as wicked a philosophy as any around. In that one teaching, you are testifying that Jesus the Christ did not accomplish His Mission when He went to the Cross, since the Jews have never had the Law written in their inward parts as specifically established and set forth in the New Testament contract.

If the Church cannot be the Jacob-Israel entity of the New Covenant, because the blessings are racial and national in substance, and the Jewish people cannot be Israel because it is obvious over the past 2,000 years that the Law was never written in their hearts and minds, who then are the Israel people in the world today? Has there been and is there a race of people who seem to have the Law written in their minds and hearts since the moment of the Cross? What race of people do you find written about in *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (#310 @ \$7.20)? Do you see any Negro or Chinese people listed? No, they are all our forefathers of Europe who are being bound to the stake. Do you find any Jews there? No, all are Caucasians and they were put to death for their Christian faith, mistaken though they may have been. There is a very old book printed in 1680 by Rev. John H. Thompson titled "A Cloud of Witnesses." A glance down the Table of Contents finds the names of Alison, Bryce, Cochran, Finlay, Nesbit, Potter, Smith and Watt. Not one Jewish name. Not one Chinese or Indian name. The last testimony of one James Robinson, who was executed in Edinburgh, Scotland on December 15, 1682, was eighteen pages long. He had a lot to get off his chest before he died. It begins with these inspiring words "Dear Friends, True Lovers of Zion's Righteous Cause, ... (ending) ... Farewell to all things in time ... Farewell Holy Scriptures, Farewell prayer, meditation, faith and hope. Welcome Father, Son, and Holy Spirit ... Welcome praises for evermore."

If you have an older copy of the KJ Bible, take a look at the foreword written by the translators. Note that after they had studied the Scriptures in the original texts, they identified Great Britain, France and Ireland as "Zion" on the fifth line of the first paragraph. If you have a KJ Bible printed in recent years, don't bother. The "principalities, powers, rulers of darkness of this world - the spiritual wickedness in high places" (Eph 6:12) - do not want you to have this information. All Gideon Bibles, the famous Thompson Chain, and the Dake Annotated Reference Bible, and every Scofield Bible have deliberately removed this valuable Foreword. They do not want you to know that until just the last 100 years or so, the Caucasian people were believed to be Zion, the people of The Book. These translators even stated that King James was the Hopeful Seed, alluding to the seed of the Scepter of Judah set forth in Genesis 49.

Here we have two witnesses, a man who was executed for his faith in 1680, and the scholarly translators of the

King James Bible, both telling us that it is among the Caucasian people that we are to look to find Zion, the people of the New Testament, and the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel. There are many sources for this information if people would only make the effort to look for them. No other people fit, in such exact detail at every point, those marks of Israel identification throughout the Bible. What other people have fulfilled, and seem to be fulfilling every prophecy set forth in the Holy Writ? There are only three classifications of people ever taught to be the Israel of God in Bible prophecy. One is the Church. The second is the Jewish people. The third are the Caucasian people - who as a racial group have become Christians, of one brand or another, in the hundreds of millions for two millennia. Who else has published all the Bibles, sent missionaries everywhere, and been the helping people to all who suffer famine and natural disasters? With precious few exceptions, that divine appointment, that calling from the foundation of the world, has fallen upon those of us of the Caucasian race. The Servant race of God.

The Jacob-Israel people, God's Caucasian race, do not hate anyone except those who are ordained to be God's enemies. We are God's servant people, those destined by God to be the helpers and the healers of others, even those, to use the scriptural word, who are the *dogs* among us. For two hundred years, since Oliver Holden wrote it, we have sung the Coronation hymn:

*"Ye Chosen Seed of Israel's Race'
Ye Ransomed from The Fall,
Bring forth His Royal Diadem,
And crown Him Lord of All."*

What did the translators of the King James Bible know, and the martyrs for Christ know, and Oliver Holden of the Massachusetts Bay Colony know, that the ministers of today have taken from you? They never tell you that the Gentiles" are in fact the lost sheep of the House of Israel, scattered across the world, generally north and west of Jerusalem, some 745 years before Christ. You have never been told the glorious truth that instead of being racial outsiders struggling to be "grafted in," we are actually those stubborn sheep who eventually hear His voice and follow Him. It is exciting to know who we are, and that while we were yet sinners, God called us into His marvellous light. Isn't it wonderful and humbling to finally know that you and your children are inheritors of the Kingdom to come, by both faith and race through the election of God?

If what I have written here is the truth, and it is, surely you would not let anyone take it away from you. If you will not let it be taken from you, then you are worthy to be included among those Christians found in Psalm 149, who have been given a major task to do before Christ is to return again. May The Lord grant us the wisdom to understand His Word. Amen.

Courtesy Virginia Christian Israelites, PO Box 109, Round Hill VA 20142

Hi, another month gone, and getting close now to Marella and Greg's wedding (10th). We wish them God's blessing for their future together.

We are still encountering some problems with DVD's getting them copied from old VHS, but hope we can eventually get rid of the problems. Please bear with us in the meantime, as we try to sort out the problems. Thanks again for the letters and orders and for your ongoing support. Sorry if we can't reply to all, but I am very busy with the Pipe Organ rebuild, which takes up a fair bit of my time. May our God bless you and keep you, and watch over and protect you,

