



Christian Identity Ministries' (in conjunction with N.Q. 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) www.christianidentityministries.com

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

#268

Covenant Messenger

July AD2008

"QUEEN OF JUDAH"

by Pastor Don Elmore

As one thinks of the ruination of Christian America, one has to think of when the major change occurred. Was it when the preaching switched to Arminian revivals led by evangelists like Charles Gradison Finney, Barton W. Stone, Sidney Rigdon, Joseph Smith, James McGready, Alexander and Thomas campbell, Walter Scott, etc., or was it when the Humanists wrote the Pledge of Allegiance, or was it when the Rationalists came to the development of the teaching of evolution, or was it when

As one sees the situations that we are now in—the fallacy of the money system, the abdication of the Sabbath Day—including the land Sabbath, the equality of the military, the popularity of birth control, usury, the great increase of personal and national debt, the large increase in the acceptance of the drug culture, and the possibility that we could have a woman as the president of the United States—Hillary Clinton.

"As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them." (Isaiah 3:12a)

The Constitution does not forbid this. But when the Queen came on the scene in the House of Judah after the ministry of Elijah and during the ministry of Elisha, she was the daughter of King Ahab of the House of Israel. She overturned what God had instructed Israel.

When Ahab was questioned and rebuked for his role in the murder of naboth and the overtaking of his vineyard, the Scripture says:

"And it came to pass, when Ahab heard those words, that he tore his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his flesh, and fasted, and lay in sackcloth, and went softly. And the word of the LORD came to Elijah, the Tishbite, saying, Seest thou how Ahab humbleth himself before me. Because he humbleth himself before me, I will not bring the evil in his days; but in his son's days will I bring the evil upon his house." (1 Kings 21:27-29).

The promise of God that the house of Ahab would become like the house of Jeroboam and like the house of Baasha would wait until his death and the reign of his son. Ahab soon died and his son, Ahaziah, reigned over the kingdom of Israel./

Ahaziah only reigned for two years. He did evil in the sight of the LORD, for he served Baal, and worshipped him, and provoked to anger the LORD God of Israel (1 Kings 22:51-53). Ahaziah fell down through a lattice in his upper chamber and was sick. And he said unto his messengers "to go and inquire of Baalzebub, the god of Ekron, whether I shall recover from this disease" (2 Kings 1:2).

But the angel of the LORD said to Elijah to go to the

messengers and say unto them, *"Is it because there is not a God in Israel, that ye go to inquire of Baalzebub, the god of Ekron? Now, therefore, thus saith the LORD, Thou shalt not come down from that bed to which thou art gone, but shall surely die"* (1 Kings 1:3,4a)

So, Ahaziah died and Ahab's son Jehoram reigned in his stead. During his reign, Elisha had one of the children of the prophets pour oil over Jehu's head and anoint Jehu king over Israel. In addition to these things, he said:

"And thou shalt smite the house of Ahab, thy master, that I may avenge the blood of my servants, the prophets, and the blood of all the servants of the LORD, at the hand of Jezebel. For the whole house of Ahab shall perish; and I will cut off from Ahab every male, bond and free, in Israel." (2 Kings 9:8).

DOUBLE ASSASSINATION

So Jehu rose up in his chariot and came to Jezreel where king Jehoram was recovering from his wounds suffered in the battle with Syria. With him, was his brother and King of Judah, Ahaziah. . Both the kings went out to meet Jehu, but Jehu quickly turned upon both of them. First he killed Jehoram and cast him on the portion of the field of Naboth and later killed his brother, Ahaziah. The onslaught was on.

Ahab had more than seventy sons (2 Kings 10:1a). All these were executed as well as many others. In fact, Jehu destroyed Baal out of Israel (2 Kings 10:28). So well did Jehu in executing the house of Ahab that God said his children would reign for four generations upon the throne of

IN THIS ISSUE:

The Queen of Judah, Don Elmore,	1
The Church, Arnold Kennedy,	3
Before The 'Protocols,'	7
What's Wrong With Christian Fantasy for Young ...	9
The Role of the Old Testament in The Church,	12
Does My Praying Offend You,	14

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

the house of Israel.

“Because thou hast done well in executing that which is right in mine eyes, and has done unto the house of Ahab according to all that was in thine heart, thy children of the fourth generation shall sit on the throne of Israel. But Jehu took no heed to walk in the law of the LORD God of Israel with all his heart; for he departed not from the sins of Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin” (2 Kings 10:30-31).

Jehu quickly continued his murderous journey. After assassinating the two sons of Ahab, who were kings of both the House of Israel and the House of Judah—he continued on killing the sons of Ahab. In addition, he killed of the worshippers of Baal.

This was accomplished by calling for all of the Baal worshippers to come to worship in a big meeting. He even safeguarded this by instructing the followers to go into the meeting and point out to him anyone who was not a Baal worshipper. At Jehu’s command, the men turned on the assembly and killed all who were there. If any escaped, then life would be taken for their life (so you can bet non escaped!).

Besides killing the two kings and slaughtering the Baal worshippers, Jehu killed Zebebel, the brethren of Ahaziah, Ahab’s seventy sons of Samaria, and slew all who remained of Ahab. King Jehu of Israel executed the descend-

dants of Ahab. At the time, both Kings of Israel and Judah were sons of Ahab—Jehoram of Israel and Ahaziah of Judah. They were killed on the same day by king Jehu.

This made Jehu king over Israel. He had been previously appointed to this position through the ministry of Elisha. But in the Kingdom of Judah a very different thing occurred,

The mother of the slain Ahaziah, Athaliah, took control. She was a daughter of Ahab. She immediately killed of all the descendants of the royal seed. She unknowingly forgot one—Joash—a newborn son that was rescued by his aunt and hidden in the bedchamber along with his nurse.

King Joash’s mother was Zibiah of Beersheba (2 Kings 12:1). King Joash was the son of King Ahaziah, which means that he had more than one wife, or had concubines. For he was married to Athaliah, who was a daughter of Ahab (I think Don has missed something here, because above he said that Ahaziah was a son of Ahab, and also that Athaliah was a daughter of Ahab, so were they brother and sister???)

But this was rather common in those days. King Ahab had seventy sons in Samaria (2 Kings 10:1). Now all these sons were not from one wife—Jezebel, the daughter of Ethbaal, king of the Sidonians (1 Kings 16:31b)) And his daughters? The Bible does not tell us; but I am sure that he had more than Athaliah.

Nevertheless, Athaliah, daughter of Ahab, married King Ahaziah, king over the former rival kingdom of Judah. Now Jehoshaphat had riches and honor in abundance and made a marriage alliance with Ahab (2 Chron. 18:1). No doubt because of this alliance, Jehoshaphat felt he had to help Ahab in his battles with Syria. After the miraculous story of this battle with Syria—where Ahab disguises himself and Jehoshaphat wears his kingly

robes—the king of Syria goes after Jehoshaphat but he was spared by God.

And then the Scripture reveals the way of the LORD: *“And a certain man drew a bow at a venture, and smote the king of Israel between the joints of the armor. Therefore, he said to his chariot man, Turn thine hand that thou mayest carry me out of the host; for I am wounded* (2 Chron. 18:33).

When Jehoshaphat returned to his home in Jerusalem, Jehu, the son of Hanani, the seer, went out to meet him, and said to King Jehoshaphat:

“Shouldest thou help the wicked, and love them that hate the LORD? Therefore, there is wrath upon thee from before the LORD (2 Chron. 19:2)

Nevertheless, Jehoshaphat proved himself before God. He brought many back unto the LORD God of their fathers and performed many judicial reforms. But the major victory was when the Moabites, Ammonites and Edomites joined to battle Judah. Jehoshaphat didn’t know what to do—so he acknowledged God was sovereign and God responded:

“Be not afraid nor dismayed by reason of this great multitude; for the battle is not yours, but God’s (2 Chron 20:15b).

God then gave to King Jehoshaphat instructions as to

Old Historic Videos:

Jack Mohr Talks about Korea, and his experiences under torture and facing a firing squad, and his escape.

My Lessons from Babylon, by health professional Ken Anderson, how he was persecuted and went to jail for helping people; and The Tabernacle & The Law, by Jarah Crawford.

DVD#CI-054 @ sug don \$15

Jack Mohr talks to Non-Christians, Luke-warm Christians, to Born-Again Christians, and Veterans; The Feminine Mystique, a good message for the ladies, both young and old, by Cheri Peters; and How To Interpret the News, by The Spotlight’s own Lois Peterson.

DVD#CI-055 @ sug don \$15

KINGS OF ISRAEL

KINGDOM OF ISRAEL

1. JEROBOAM (931-910)
2. NADAB (910-909)
3. BAASHA (909-886)
4. ELAH (886-885)
5. ZIMRI (885)
6. OMRI (885-874)
7. AHAB (874-853)
8. AHAZIAH (853-852) (Dies from fall through Lattice)

Transference of Elijah’s ministry to Elisha’s

9. JORAM (852-841) — (Murdered by Jehu) —
10. JEHU (841-814)
11. JEHOAHAZ (814-798) *Elisha dies*

KINGDOM OF JUDAH

1. REHOBOAM (931-913)
2. ABIJAH (913-911)
3. ASA (911-870)
4. JEHOASHAPHAT (870-848)
5. JEHORAM (848-841)
6. AHAZIAH (841)
7. ATHALIAH (841-835)
8. JOASH (835-796)

AHAB	JEHOASHAPHAT
Daughter: ATHALIAH	married JEHORAM (Letter from Elijah; Dies from an incurable disease of the intestines)
	AHAZIAH (murdered by Jehu; Mother Athaliah; Married Zibiah of Beersheba)
ATHALIAH (mother of Ahaziah—Queen of Judah)	
	JOASH (son of Ahaziah—mother Zibiah of Beersheba; Jehoshabeath, daughter of Jehoram and wife of Jehoiada the priest and sister to Ahaziah, saves him)



how he was going to be victorious over them - three warring foes. Put the priests out in the front, followed by the choir—who would sing praises to the Lord God of Israel (no doubt, with the Psalms of David). And when the choir began to say, Praise the LORD; for his mercy endureth forever—the LORD set an ambush against the children of Ammon, Moab and Edom who were come against Judah; and they were smitten. (2 Chron 20:29-30).

After Ahaziah reigned for two short years after Ahab, then this brings us to the realms when the two brothers of Ahab reigned over both kingdoms—Israel and Judah.

Things were so bad in both kingdoms, that the daughter of Ahab killed her rivals for the kingdom and she stood alone as the “Queen of Judah” for over six years. But, unbeknown to her, a secret son was saved and hidden until he was seven years old. At that time it was decided that it was the time to strike, and he came out of hiding and he was crowned as king of Judah.

We are in as bad a shape now as then—if not worse.

Courtesy New Covenant Messenger Box 321 Union KY

THE CHURCH

Arnold Kennedy

Early in the Christian life, the convert is told something about “The Church.” The word *ekklesia* may be used, and it may be correctly spoken of as *that which is called out*. So far, so good, but then the problem begins. Called out of what? The usual explanation given is *called out of the world*. Fair enough, but what is the meaning of *the world*?

The chapter [of **THE EXCLUSIVE-NESS OF ISRAEL, #714 @ \$22.55**] entitled, *Which World Did God “So Love”?* was written to show that there are different “worlds” in Scripture, not just the one world supposedly consisting of everyone of every race who is not converted [e.g. as ‘the world of music’ or ‘the world of sport’ or ‘the world of Israel,’ etc]

Then we looked at “adoption” to show who was adopted from where, concluding that the Sons of God were placed as sons (not adopted) out of the genetic seed of Abraham, through Isaac.

We also looked at “strangers,” considering whether or not genetic stock other than Abraham’s seed could join themselves to Israel, and become *as Israel* by keeping the Law, Circumcision and the Passover. We found that there were different words for “strangers” and showed that this proposition was basically invalid. Consideration of the matter of “seeds” showed that there is no such thing as a *spiritual seed*, as is commonly presented, and that the genetic seed of Abraham cannot be spiritualised away. We will now see that “the Church” is called out from amongst Israel. In this chapter, “The Church” is placed in quotation marks, because it is commonly used in a way that is un-biblical. The Greek word translated “church” means a called-out assembly. It is sometimes translated as assembly.

Thayer: “A gathering of citizens called out from their homes into some public place. as assembly.”

SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT “THE CHURCH”

To find out what we are talking about, we have to ask some questions:

1. Can the church really be separated from Israel?
2. Is it called out from every race?
3. Can all men of all races be potential inheritors of the Kingdom of God?
4. Is there prophecy to support the current common theory that *The Church* has replaced Israel?
5. Could the “wife” be other than Israel?
6. What was the *church in the wilderness*?

7. What is the *church of the firstborn*?

8. What about the promises made to David and David’s eternal throne?

9. Does *of your brethren* as found in the New Testament suddenly change somehow to be *spiritual* brethren?

10. Why are there so many references to *the fathers* in the New Testament, when *the fathers* have no connection with non-Israel races?

11. Why is national Israel still separate in the book of Revelation?

In looking into these questions, we will find that our normal religious education impedes understanding and that what is being presented here is at variance with the popular teachings.

THE ORIGIN OF THE WORD “CHURCH”

The word originates from the Greek word *kuriakos* which means *belonging to the Lord*. From this word has developed the German *kirche*, the Dutch *kerk*, the Scottish *kirk* and the English *church*. The word is first found in the Great Bible of 1570. In no way does the word originate from *ekklesia*, even if tradition would like to say that it does.

In The Book of Revelation by R.K. and R.N. Phillips, 1982: “The term **ekklesia** is the combination of two Greek words, **ek - out of**, or **from**, and **klesis - to call**. **Ecclesia** simply means an assembly, any assembly of people who are called out from other peoples and from which all aliens and slaves have been excluded [see *Ellicott’s comments on Matt 16:18*]. Hence it is used of the whole nation of Israel, as distinct from other nations. For those who claim that trying to limit **ekklesia** to Israel is a biased view, please read Dr. E.W. Bullinger [The *Apocalypse of the Day of the Lord*] from which these notes are summarised.

The Old Testament equivalent is the Hebrew word *cahal* [or *qahal*] which means to call or to assemble together, but there is not one place where it is rendered “church.” *Cahal* is used seventy times and is mostly translated as “congregation,” this being the congregation of Israel. An interesting feature is that this word is used for those called out of Israel to assemble before the Tabernacle and Temple, and it denies or excludes the “mixed multitude: (*edah* - which is also translated as *congregation*) which comprised of those from other races who had joined themselves to Israel. In the New Testament there was a parallel situation of there bring a “mixed multitude” in the Judean nation.

THE FOUNDATION OF “THE CHURCH”

The word *church* is usually thought of traditionally as being a New Testament word, because it is supposed to be a multi-racial entity, whereas in the Old Testament, Israel was a single race. Let us look at the foundation of the Church as given by Jesus.

“And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” (Mat 16:18).

This is after Jesus asked two questions, *Who do men say that I am?* and *Who do you say that I am?* Peter replied, *Thou art the Son of the Living God*. (unlike many today who want to say: ‘Thou art the Living God’). Jesus then said to Peter, *Thou art petros* [masculine] *and upon this petra* [feminine] *I will build my assembly*. Therefore *petra* and *petros* cannot refer to the same thing. The latter word must refer to something within the preceding conversation. However, the two traditional views are:

1. The Roman Catholic view - that “The Church” is built upon the Apostle Peter.
2. The Protestant view - that “The Church” is built



upon the rock itself. The translators of the KJV did not give the word *rock* a capital "R" as might have been expected. The traditional teaching from this verse is that Jesus is the rock upon which He builds His Church [assembly]. This sounds quite reasonable until we look into the words used in the verse. [Please note that it is not being said that Jesus is not the cornerstone of the foundation].

The word, *petros*, is simply a small rock or stone that came from a larger rock. The second word for rock is *petra*, the feminine of the very same word, but it refers to a huge immovable mass of rock. Now, if Jesus is the rock in question upon which the church is founded, then Jesus would also have to be feminine! So, we had better look further into some *petra* verses to find out in what sense the *rock* is used.

Vine says: *Petra* denotes a mass of rock, as distinct from *petros* a detached stone or boulder, or a stone that might easily be thrown.

For example: "Therefore whosoever hears these sayings of mine, and does them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock [petra]. Mat 7:24.

"As it is written, Behold I lay in Sion a stumblingstone [lithos], and a rock [petra] of offence: and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. Rom 9:33.

Jesus' words are the stumbling stone Israel could trip up on. This never applies to peoples other than Israel. But the stone in Romans 9 is not *petra* or *petros*, it is *lithos*. The *stumbling stone* and the *rock* are not the same words. Jesus said those who build their houses in response to these sayings of mine are those who build on the feminine *petra*. Jesus was then addressing his disciples [Israelites all], and not the Scribes and Pharisees in the mixed multitude.

The people who are the subject of the discussion in both verses, are stated to be Israel [and they are Israel only]. Peter also uses the two quite different words for stone or rock in the same manner and in the one context.

"Unto you therefore which believe he is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone [lithos] which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and a stone [lithos] of stumbling, and a rock [petra] of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient: whereunto also they were appointed." 1 Pet 2:7-8.

Lithos is a stone or rock that has been fashioned or worked over, for example, a corner stone, a tomb stone or a mill stone. So, there can be no mistake. In these verses we see three distinct terms:

petros: a rough, unfinished, unsophisticated stone that is a chip off a large lump of rock - like the rubble at the bottom of a cliff.

lithos: a worked, piece of stone that has been produced for a particular purpose.

petra: a huge, unmovable mass of rock - like Ayer's Rock in Australia. It is more than foundation rock - it is awesome in its immensity.

The great unmovable rock of Matt 16:18 was the statement: *Thou art the Son of the living God*. For a human being like Peter, to reach a point where this statement can be made is a momentous occasion. It is the dawn-breaking realization that Jesus is no ordinary man. It is the actions taken in response to this discovery that shows what we believe. This is why the called-out ones are the ones who

believe this rock solid statement and build on it. - To be wise, we must consider well Jesus' words.

COULD "THE CHURCH" TAKE OVER THE PROMISES MADE TO ISRAEL?

In the last chapter of the Book of Romans, it is sometimes claimed that the dispersed of Israel rejected the salvation of God, and when Paul turned to the "Gentiles" [v.28], he was supposed to be turning to non-Israel stock. "The Church" is thus said to contain non-Israelites, and to have taken over all the promises that had been made to Israel. We need to consider three issues in connection with those verses:

1. Paul was speaking with Judeans who were then in Rome. He turned to the House of Israel because *they will hear it*. In all of Paul's epistles, he writes to Israelites [see EXCLUSIVENESS, chapter "That Unfortunate Word 'Gentile'"].

2. There is only one set of promises in prophecy and these are made to Israel. There is no separate set made for any non-Israelite church. The fulfillment can only be made in the same people, or as Paul puts it, *in us, their children*.

3. The doctrine of the Kinsman-Redeemer would have to be ignored. God is faithful not to break His own laws. Jesus is the Kinsman-Redeemer of Israel, not of others

who are not kinsmen. The called-out ones are those of Israel who believe Him and change their lives accordingly. They had previously been *under the Law*. These from among Israel are the members of the *ekklesia*, the assembly (not church!).

WHO IS "THE ASSEMBLY"?

When Stephen was addressing the Judean leaders, he related the history of Israel to them. This is what "got them going." These leaders were a mixture of *men* and *brethren*, both appearing jointly as *elders*.

Stephen reminded them of the prophecy that Moses had made about a prophet being raised up unto Israel *like unto me* and that *him shall ye hear*. Jesus was to be raised up unto the very same [like] racial group of people. Stephen goes on to say:

"This is he, that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spoke to him in the Mount Sinai, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give to us." Acts 7:38.

Here we find mention of the church [*ekklesia*] which also existed in the Old Testament. This means that they are the same entity. Stephen isolates *the church* as having *our fathers* in a genetic way. This is not what is taught in our Bible schools and churches, because it does not fit with the multi-racial conception of "The Church." The Israelites were on their own, separate from the other races in the wilderness. Stephen tells of the lively oracles given to *us*. That these oracles were given to Israel alone has been shown from many Scriptures. Let us go on to look at other places where we find the word *ekklesia*.

"... and to all the flock, over which holy ghost has made you overseers, to feed the church (ekklesia) of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Acts 20:28.

We could look at this flock later because it adds to what is being said. Israel as *sheep* in prophecy ties up with sheep in the New Testament. They isolate Israel as being the same people in both Testaments. In this verse Paul is addressing the *church of God*. The church has been purchased, or bought back, by Jesus' blood. *Bought back* signifies that they were previously a possession of God. Without going

Tapes of the Month:

D-022 What Then Shall We Do? A

Place to begin.

D-023 Why Suffering? The goal of Christian suffering

D-024 Obedient To God's Call. Sons of Abraham, pt 1.

D-025 Abraham, The Meek. Sons of Abraham, pt 2 - all Lawrence Blanchard
4 tapes @ sug don \$16



into this as a subject, it can be stated that this can apply only to the nation of Israel. As Zacharias prophesied, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed His people ... to remember his holy covenant, and the oath which He sware to our father Abraham" Luke 1:67, 73. All this identification could not possibly apply to other races. *The assembly (ekklesia)* is of Israel, and of Israel only, and these are the ones who he hath purchased with his own blood as quoted above.

There are a number of references to the local assemblies [*ekklesia*] in various towns and even in houses, but there is no need to quote these verses. But, there are things about these assemblies that are significant.

"Unto the church (*ekklesia*) of God which is at Corinth, to them which are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called (to be) saints," 1 Cor 1:2.

This qualifies who are the members of the assemblies. The calling is essential. *Both He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one, for which cause He is not shamed to call them brethren* [Heb 2;11-13]. God's name is declared among the brethren ... *in the midst of the church* [*ekklesia*] will I sing praise unto thee ... I and the children which God has given me." This assembly can never be stretched beyond this to include everyone on earth.

"Let your women keep silent in the churches (*ekklesia*): for it is not permitted for them to speak, but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. 1 Cor 14:34.

Here we see a connection between the Law given to Israel and the persons being addressed. The assemblies consist of the same people who knew the Law. Therefore they must be the Israel people.

WHAT IS THE ASSEMBLY?

His *body*, is the one word which describes the assembly in Scripture.

Eph 1:22,23 ...and gave him to be the head over all things to the church (*ekklesia*) which is **His body**, ...

Col. 1:18 And He is the head of **the body**, the church (*ekklesia*): ...

Col. 1:24 ... for **His body's** sake, which is the church (*ekklesia*): ...

Eph. 5:23 for the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church (*ekklesia*), and he is the saviour of **the body**.

The word *soma* (body) has similar connotation as the human body in many verses where it is used, according to dictionaries and lexicons:

Vine: 'soma' The word is also used for physical nature, as distinct from *pneuma*; the spiritual nature.

Strong: 'soma' From 4982; the body [as a sound whole], used in a very wide application, lit. or fig.: bodily, body, slave.

In Eph 5:23, there are the masculine aspects, the "husband," "head" and "christ" with the feminine aspects, the "wife," "church" and the neuter noun "body." The assembly has a head and a body. The spoken voice comes only from the head, from the husband aspect. The feminine aspect, the body, has no words of its own; it is subject to the

head in all things. The head controls the body. Where this is not so, then what is found is not the true assembly.

Paul says Israel would remain in that darkness until they were *made nigh in Christ Jesus by His Blood* [Eph 2:13]. But they are not spoken of as being *the body* until they are *made nigh*. These that are made nigh are the assembly. They come out from Israel only. Israel had been dead in their trespasses and sins through the broken Law and had walked according to the course of *this world*, but some were now quickened [or made alive] and saved by Grace. This is no different than what has been written in the [Exclusiveness] chapter entitled *Adoption*. The story is the same.

So far we have the one body which is the *ekklesia*. This is one single body. In the New Testament, the KJV translators translated the singular word *ekklesia* as "churches" 37 times. It would have been better if the translators had used the word "congregation" or "assembly." Congregation is not used by the translators as a New Testament word, apart from Acts 13:43. Here we have the start of the problem with the word church. Because of the translations, we wrongly associate the word church [as a place] with congregation [as people]. This gives problems when reading

through the Word. Sometimes our own conception of the church as a place where we go to is adequate, although in reality each person there must be a called-out one. They must all be of the *ekklesia*, they must all be of Israel. The place of the meeting is the sunagoge [used 58 times]. In the Old Testament there are three major words that have to do with the assembly. These words are:

Mowed; refers to the meeting place or the meeting itself. The translators had "a lot of fun" translating this word, giving it meanings such as *assembly, appointed, seasons, congregation* and *solemn*. There are 24 references. All these translations do not help to make understanding easy. It means an appointed meeting

or their coming together. This word is inclusive of everyone within the Israelite camp, both Israelite and non-Israelite.

Cahal; An assembly called together - invited out of the whole congregation. The word only relates to racial Israelites, and so does not include any of the mixed multitude within the Israelite camp. These are the called-out ones who alone applied the blood of the Passover lamb.

Edah; The whole assembly inclusive of both Israelites and the mixed multitude. Unfortunately, both '*edah* and *qahal* are translated as "congregation" and this rives rise to the misconception that the mixed multitude had the same total position as the Israelite bloodline. A parallel situation of mixture applied in Judea at the time of Jesus and a similar position is found among our assemblies today.

In both Testaments, the *cahal* and *ekklesia* are used exclusively of the seed of Abraham.

1 Tim 3:15 "But if you tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church (*ekklesia*) of the living God, the

New Videos:

REVERSING THE RACIAL REVOLUTION

Prof. Andrew Fraser - before an audience of 200 people at the 2006 Inverell Forum, explained why he was barred from teaching. He also explained why his views were so controversial and how a managerial class is now in charge of not only universities, but all of academia and indeed, of government itself. Prof. Fraser says that freedom cannot rely alone on written documents, but must be supported by free people willing to stand up and be counted. He believes that the prevailing political correctness is hypocritical in that some of the university disciplines, such as law and psychology, daily deal with racial differences, yet are afraid to speak out publicly about those differences. This is not academic freedom. The prevailing atmosphere curtails academic debate and will allow only that debate that moves toward a preconceived utopia of racial harmony which lives only in the minds of those who have much to gain by the concept. He believes he was barred from teaching for no other reason than that he tried to open an academic debate. 1 Hour 23 min.

DVD#CI-523 @ sug don \$20



pillar and ground of the truth.

The ground or *hedraïoma* of the truth, means *to make stable, settle firmly, a stay or support* [Thayer].

THE ASSEMBLY OF GOD

“Give no offence, neither to the Jews (Judeans), nor to the Gentiles (Hellen: Greeks), nor to the church [assembly] of God.

Three groups are mentioned in this verse:

1. Unconverted “Jews,” or the Judeans of Israel.
2. Unconverted “Gentiles” of the Dispersion of Israel.
3. The converted ones from these two who are the assembly of God.

The popular reasoning from this verse is that assembly is comprised of converted people from out of the “Jews and Gentiles.” This is thus thought to encompass every race on earth. But, as these “Gentiles” are the House of Israel, the assembly must be comprised of those who are from the House of Judah plus the House of Israel, who are redeemed under the terms of the New Testament made to Israel. Scripture says the New Testament is made with these two houses alone [Heb 8:8]. This confirms what we saw under the chapter Adoption. In the above verse, then, no offence is to be given to any of Israel stock from either House, whether converted or unconverted. The context as given in verses 1 and 2 of this chapter in Corinthians is Israel. Those being addressed in the first vs of chapter 10 had “fathers” who were associated with Moses, this means they were Israelites.

THE CHURCH WHICH IS THE SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN

Today, although we have open, unashamed, so-called “churches” of Satan, these are not our concern here. The Synagogue of Satan is an imitation and a counterfeit of the real thing. Jesus spoke about the synagogue of Satan in Rev. 2:9 and 3:9. This synagogue of Satan co-exists with what is translated as the “churches.” If we venture to say that the members of Satan’s synagogue are such because they are not of the seed of Abraham, some might object and they might object loudly. Jesus says that these of Satan’s synagogue call themselves Judeans *and are not*. They profess to be of God’s people but they are not. Jesus says so, and in the Gospels He also points to the *children of the wicked* (one- being added by the translators). This indicated that they are a different seed. This distinction must be kept in mind.

“The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the Kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked (one).” Matt 13:38.

Here we see two different ‘children.’ Jesus says that a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit. It is absolutely impossible. Peter tells of two differing seeds, the corruptible and the incorruptible. This compares the natural man of Genesis 1 with the spirit-carrying man of Genesis 2. The *good seed* is the only seed which can be quickened by the Word of God. So, is there a corruptible seed and an incorruptible seed or not? Peter is writing to the “elect” (chosen) nation and he tells about the salvation that should come to this people. The prophets of Israel searched for the grace

that was to come to Israel [1 Peter 1:10]. Is God not allowed to make such choices? Is God not allowed to be merciful to those whom He will? Yes, but we are taught this is not so and that every kin is the same and has the same opportunity. The tares, like the trees from corrupt seed, have the destiny of being cast into the fire. Amongst Israel were, and still are:

[a] The false prophets which come to you in sheep’s clothing [Mat 7:15]

[b] Men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the truth [2 Tim 3:8]

[c] Those who lay in wait to deceive [Eph 4:14]

[d] Men speaking perverse things to draw away disciples [Acts 20:28-31].

These are the false teachers who can be identified by:

[a] Their *winds of doctrine* (Eph 4:14)

[b] Their Christian doctrines from seducing spirits with *doctrines of devils* (1 Tim 4:1)

[c] Their perversion of *the right ways of the Lord* (Acts 13:10)

These all look like the real thing in outward profession!

They use God’s word in the way adversaries do. They say *Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Your Name, and in thy name have cast out devils, and done many wonderful works?* This would be enough to convince the average church-goer that these were so-called spirit-filled [present tense] and born again Christians [perish both expressions]. They are one thing outwardly, but inwardly they are ravaging wolves. The outward wonderful works claimed are works and not Grace.. Works are not fruit; only the good seed can produce that. Fruit is produced, by God, as the good seed abides in the Vine. The seed is manifested

by actions; it is by their *fruit ye shall know them*. Wonderful works, in themselves, prove absolutely nothing. Jesus says of them, *I never knew you*. *Never* is *oudepote*.

Vine: *oudepote*: from *oude*, not even, and *pote*, at any time and is used in definite negative statements.

He never knew them. But who will agree with Jesus today? So let us now see how Satan’s synagogue also has wonderful works.

As it has been said, these things, such as the prophesying in the name of Jesus, the casting out of devils and the wonderful works, might deceive the elect.

“For false Christs and false prophets shall arise, and shall show signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect. Mark 13:22.

“Then said Jesus unto him, except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe.” John 4:48.

“An evil and adulterous generation seeks after a sign; ...” Matt 12:39.

The latter two verses were addressed to the Pharisees. The false christs and false prophets who are not of the elect, seek by signs and wonders to deceive the elect. What does the average church-goer flock to see today? What do they seek after? How would they know and discern what is deceit and seduction? Are they taught? Or do they and their pastors pray saying, *Lord, give us miracles; Lord, show us*

Featured Book

THE APOSTOLIC BIBLE POLYGLOT

is numerically coded with the AB-Strong numbering system, Greek-English Interlinear Bible, a literal translation of the Greek Old and New Testaments, English-Greek Index, and Lexical Concordance; with Old Testament based on Septuagint (LXX) Greek. - *The development of the Holy Scriptures of the early church readily adhered to the all-Greek Scriptures of both Old and New Testaments; rather than a Hebrew Old Testament - Greek New Testament structure which is prevalent today in the English Bible. This all-Greek mode was the norm in Western Churches for hundreds of years during the development of the Latin, Syriac and Coptic Scriptures. The Greek Fathers, Clement, Eusebius, and many others, all writing in Greek, quoted the Greek Old and New Testaments extensively. Introduction and explanatory notes (does not contain Apocrypha)*
#481 @ sug don \$66.00



your power; Lord, pour out your spirit; Lord, send us out. Listen to church-goers at prayer meetings. What is it that many of the people want most? They want sings and wonders! Their actions and behaviour can be impressive! But, these can be seen as mechanisms of deception.

“And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on Earth, in the sight of men.” Rev. 13:13.

How much closer to the truth could he appear to be? The Beast is shown as doing wonders in the sight of men! Look at the order of service at many modern Pentecostal-type meetings. There is a similar technique to that found in parts of the entertainment world to raise an atmosphere. The old nature is quickened. First we have the loud music and the clapping to the beat of drums. Choruses are sung proclaiming what we are, such as, *We are a people of power.* Now, what is the thought that is being instilled in the congregation’s mind? What is being whipped up? What is the ambition? Is it not to raise enough fervour to prophesy, then to cast out devils [deliverance] and then do mighty works? Then they shout supposedly binding demons but there is no change. They have done this for years. It all sounds so good. It sounds alive, but again, there are no changes. They want a name that they are alive, *but are dead?* The net result of this activity is disillusionment, defeat and apathy. The local assemblies hold a majority of disillusioned and apathetic people.

These three things, the power, the signs and the wonders, are what some people seek above all else. The Beast can do it! The Beast can make fire come down from heaven, in the sight of men, we are told [Rev 13:13, taking this literally]. So they sing, *I’m calling down fire* to get the meeting all fired up. Their fire has to come from the outside. They do not already have it within. God’s people, the elect, can easily be led astray in this area.

One thing more might be said. Consider the worship service on Mt. Carmel [1 Kings 18]. Study the worship order of the prophets of Ba’al. The Word of the Lord did not matter to them. They cried out; they cut themselves [body piercings, and tattoos?], they prophesied, but there was no fire for them. Elijah did what he did, because God’s Word told him to. He just prayed a simple prayer and the fire fell. And the ratio there was one true prophet to 450 false prophets. Could we have a similar ratio today? Although all professed to worship a god, the prophets of Ba’al did not address their god the same way Elijah addressed his God. Elijah knew his God as the Lord God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, not the Ba’al of all races. Is this the same in the noisy so-called Christian world today? Almost always it is *Christ this, and Christ that, it is Lord this, and Lord that.* They are forever saying Lord, Lord, but they are not ever doing the will of God. Their actions do not support their words. Seldom is the precious name of Jesus heard in their worship, apart from trying to use the name of Jesus to cast out demons [see Acts 8:9-24]. That

they do wonderful works *in My Name* proves nothing!

The grand old songs of the Church, The Psalms of David, the songs of Redemption, the songs of Calvary and the songs of the Saviour’s Love are not popular. No, power, signs and wonders are paramount, to them. These are what they like to sing about. They have much in common with the New Age.

We read of a “false Jew” in Acts 13:10 who ceased not to pervert the right ways of the Lord. he could not help it.

“These are spots in your feasts of charity, when they feast with you, feeding themselves without fear, clouds they are without water ... to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever.” Jude 12, 13.

Does our charity deny the Word of God which says *to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever.* Darkness is reserved for them even as surely as Israel’s inheritance is reserved for Israel [1 Peter 1:4]. There is one great thing wrong with these people, even if they profess to be

Christians. Yes, they separate themselves, but they are *not having the Spirit* [Jude 19].

REPENTANCE

Contrary to what seems like popular opinion, Repentance does not mean merely to be sorry for one’s self when caught in an act of transgressing God’s Law. Repentance means much more than to feel sorrow or regret for something that was said or done in the past. Repentance exhibits itself in two aspects—the first, which is negative, reveals itself in a change of mind, and in a turning away from sin. The second is positive—turning to God. [If ye love me, keep my commandments, Jn 14:14; If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father’s

commandments, and abide in his love. Jn 15:10; By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments, 1Jn 5:2; For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous, 1Jn 5:3.]

True Repentance means to abandon those habits which are not pleasing to God, and to turn and DO the things which are pleasing to Him. And the things which are pleasing to God are Faithfulness to Him, and to His Word, and Obedience to His Laws of Righteousness.

The word translated “Repentance” comes from the Greek word “*Metanoia*” which implies a complete change—a metamorphosis. The word is symbolized by tremendous change which occurs in the transformation of the Chrysalis into the Butterfly. So Repentance must lead to a complete change in mind and soul and spirit—the operation contemplated in Ezekiel 36:25-27.

Courtesy Man Thinking., TKC Box 1478, Ferndale WA 98248

politically incorrect history
BEFORE THE ‘PROTOCOLS’
1489 Document Shows How ‘elders’ Instructed Pupils
In ‘Khazarian Zionism’
If You Are One Of Those Who Do Not See at least some of

New Tapes/CDs

CD-C-137 **God Is So Good**, John Bishop

CD-C-138 **Helping Hurting People**, John Bishop

CD-C-139 **My Conscientious Objection**, Eric Benson

CD-G-690 **A Man After YHWH’s Own Purpose**,
 Ted Weiland

tape-J-194 **Romans 8:28-39**, pt 10, John Weaver

tape-E-235 **A Closer Look at Genesis 1 & 2**, pt 11,
 Don Elmore

tape-E-236 **A Closer Look at Genesis 1 & 2**, pt 12,
 Don Elmore

tape-E-237 **Passover, Ps 33:1-22**, Don Elmore

tape-K-536 **Blood Covenants**, 1, James Bruggeman.

tape-K-537 **Blood Covenants**, 2, James Bruggeman

LOAN ONLY CD’s

CD-U-203 **Shepherding Your Child’s Heart**, John
 Thompson (Building a Family that will last 3)

CD-U-204 **The Busy Father as Family Shepherd**,
 John Thompson (Building a Family 4)

CD-U-205 **Preparing Sons for Marriage and Life Pur-**
pose, Doug Phillips (Building a Family 5)



the roles certain conspiracy plans play in world history (those who pooh-pooh Revisionists as "kooks") then you are among the most deceived of all people, a hopeless case, so do not bother to read further. Otherwise, you will find this shocking information to be of considerable interest

by Dr. Harrell Rhome

When the information-age possibilities are considered—the Internet, I-phones, Blackberries etc—we white Americans should be perhaps the best-informed population of all time. Yet we are also the most deceived. We, the willingly deceived Euro-American, are most often our own worst enemy.

We Americans generally accept, and proclaim from our pulpits and in our schools, the most idiotic drivel about the history of the world.

Here is a short item of interest, pointing to a program, plan, plot, cabal, or whatever you call to choose to call it, that has been operating for countless centuries. Its most agreeable name is Zionism, but because the main participants (but not all) were/are of the Turko-Mongol-Khazarian Central Asian Judaized tribes who began entering Europe in the late 10th century, the most accurate moniker might just as well be Khazarian Zionism. They are not actually Semites, and their forebears never set foot in Palestine; nor did they speak Hebrew.

The plans for their eventual success are partially revealed in several old documents. One of the most interesting appears below. This 1489/1492 piece seems based on earlier "disaster contingency plans" and protocols already in place long before the letter writers posed their questions. And, just in case you do not know, the plans are succeeding.

In 1889, the *Revue des Etudes Juives*, financed by James Rothschild, published two documents putting *The Protocols* in perspective. The Learned Elders of Zion have been carrying out their plans for centuries. On January 13, 1489—as some sources date it, or a similar document, from Spain in 1492, Chemor (Chamorra), Jewish rabbi of Arles in Provence, France, wrote to the Grand Sanhedrin, which then had its seat in Constantinople, for advice because the people of Arles were threatening their synagogues. What should they do to stop this "persecution" the rabbi wanted to know.

What follow are references to a Protocols-like plan, dating from much earlier. The reply is found in the 16th-century Spanish book, *La Silva Curiosa*, by Julio-Iniguez de Medrano (Paris Orry, 1608), with a brief introduction:

"This letter following was found in the archives of Toledo by the Hermit of Salamanca, while searching the ancient records of the kingdoms of Spain, and [as] it is expressive and remarkable, I wish to write it here: 'Beloved brethren in Moses, we have received your letter in which you tell us of your anxieties and misfortunes, which you are enduring. We are pierced by as great pain to hear it as yourselves.

The advice of the grand satraps and rabbis is the following:

1. As for what you say, that the king of Spain (Ferdinand) obliges you to become Christians; do it, since you cannot do otherwise.

2. As for what you say, about the command to despoil you of your property; make your sons merchants that they may despoil, little by little, the Christians of theirs.

3. As for what you say about making attempts on your lives; make your sons doctors and apothecaries, that they may take away Christian lives.

4. As for what you say, of their destroying your synagogues: make your sons canons and clerics in order that they may destroy their churches.

5. As for the many other vexations you complain of: arrange that your sons become advocates and lawyers, and see that they always mix in affairs of state, that by putting Christians under your yoke you may dominate the world and be avenged on them.

6. Do not swerve from this order that we give you, because you will find by experience that, humiliated as you are, you will reach the actuality of power.

'Signed: Prince of the Jews of Constantinople'" [no name appears].

In a Radio Roma broadcast, April 20, 1943, the eminent poet, philosopher and scholar, Ezra Pound said:

"If or when one mentions *The Protocols*, alleged to be of the Elders of Zion, one is frequently met with the reply: 'Oh, but they are a forgery.'

"Certainly they are a forgery, and that is the one proof we have of their authenticity. The Jews have worked with forged documents for the past 2,400 years, namely ever since they have had any documents whatsoever. And no one can qualify as a historian of this half-century without having examined *The Protocols*...."

"What we know for certain is that they were published two decades ago. That Lord Sydenham wrote a preface to them. That their content has been traced to another sketch, said to have appeared in the 1840's. The interest in them does not lie in [the] question of their having been, or not been concocted by a legislative assembly of rabbis, democratically elected, or secretly chosen by the Mysterious Order of Seven Branched Antlers or the Bowling Society of Milwaukee.

"Their interest lies in the type of mind or the state of mind of their authors . . . What is interesting, perhaps most, to the historian is their definite campaign against history altogether, their declared intention to blot out the classics, to blot out the record, and to dazzle men with talk of tomorrow."

While many Jews and their "court historians" love to rant on and on about *The Protocols* being a "forgery," they never refer to the preceding information of the distinct implication that *The Protocols*, as they were manifested in the late 19th century, are but an overview, a portion of conspiracy plans that have been afoot for centuries.

Read *The Protocols* again, or just read it, if you have not already. Every point is either in full process or has already happened. Will the self-deceived ones ever wake up? The dark forces never cease in their mission to deter their circulation.

Many Internet sites and booksellers have them. (available from CIM in two versions, *The Protocols* small # 463 @ \$5.25; or the larger version *The Protocols with notes*, #464 @ \$18.30). Read them, pass them on. You never know where they might end up. Spread the word. Khazarian Zionism and the dark forces now ride the ascendant wave, and the warriors of truth and light are few and far between. This will change, but we are in a low phase of cosmic cycle when the thugs seem to have their way.

Bibliography: Marsden, Victor E., translator, *The Protocols of the Meetings of the Learned Elders of Zion*, soft-cover, 299pp., Liberty Bell Publications; reprint edition.

Dr. Harrell Rhome is a researcher and writer living in Texas. He writes for print newspapers and journals as well as Internet sites, and is a contributing editor for *The Barnes Review*. As founder of *Eagle Publications*, he also publishes *The Revisionist Observer*, a print journal, seen on-



line and The Eagle Online Magazine. Rhome is currently the only English-language columnist for Tsunami Politico (tsunamipolitico.com), a bi-monthly Spanish and English on-line magazine from Buenos Aires. He enjoys hearing from readers. Write to Dr. Rhome at POB 6303, Corpus Christi, TX 78466-6303 or email Dr. Rhome at:

EagleRevisionist@aol.com for more information.

Courtesy The Barnes Review, Nov/Dec '07, barnesreview.org

WHAT'S WRONG WITH UN-CHRISTIAN FANTASY FOR YOUNG READERS?

Lee Duigon

"Of course there must be lots of Magic in the world," he said wisely one day. "but people don't know what it is like or how to make it. Perhaps the beginning is just to say nice things are going to happen until you make them happen . . ." - Frances Hodgson Burnett, *The Secret Garden* (1911)¹

Every good and perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variability, neither shadow of turning. James 1:17.

Visit the young readers' section of your local bookstore, and you'll probably be amazed by the plethora of fantasies. There are still plenty of more or less "realistic" novels, mainly dealing with sexual issues and assorted teenage angst; but it certainly looks like fantasy is king in this market.

In this sea of fantasy, islands of Christianity are few and far between. This seems strange when you consider that among the most famous young readers' fantasies are those written by C.S. Lewis (*The Chronicles of Narnia*) and J.R.R. Tolkien (*The Hobbit*, *The Lord of the Rings*), which are widely—we cannot say universally—recognized as "Christian fantasies" written by "Christian writers." [we do **not** recommend reading these! CIM]

But the bulk of it is anything but Christian. Whether the fantasy world described in a novel is openly antagonistic to God and His Word, or simply oblivious to Him, some of these books are bound to fall into young Christian readers' hands. The booming popularity of fantasy practically guarantees it. [read the article above, and realize who runs most publishing houses, and you'll understand why!]

What's wrong with un-Christian fantasy? How, if you deem it necessary, might you convince your twelve-year-old to stay away from it—or at least equip him to recognize its faults? And given the powerful allure of imaginative fiction, is it possible to offer your child "Christian fantasy" in its place?

FANTASY FAMILIES

Even Christians, in our deeply secularized society, have been taught to compartmentalize their lives, creating many tidy little areas in which they find no place for God. A few have boiled it down to the point where the only compartment left for God is in the church on Sunday morning. And for many, "entertainment" and "recreation" have become God-free zones, as typified by remarks like, "Heck, it's only a movie."

Bearing this in mind, let's look at some of the features that most of today's young readers' fantasies have in common.

1. The protagonists of these stories are teens or children, and they almost always have disturbed family situations.

To some extent, this is hard to avoid. To make a young teen the hero of a story, he or she must be able to act independently of his family, especially the parents. Normal par-

ents can't be expected to allow their children to go out on life-threatening adventures. The author must somehow get around that obstacle. But in most fantasies, the authors resort to demeaning the protagonists' families. In J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series—the best-selling fiction series of all time²—Harry's parents are dead and he lives with his aunt and uncle, the Dursleys. Rowling depicts them as hopelessly stupid, ignorant, incompetent, and ineffectual, not to mention bigoted. Living at the Hogwarts School of magic for most of the year, Harry isn't seriously inconvenienced by his foster parents. On those rare occasions when they have the opportunity to interfere with his activities, he easily outsmarts them.

The hero of *Tunnels*, a new book by Roderick Gordon and Brian Williams, lives with a rather strange and dysfunctional family, according to a review in *teenreads.com*,³ featuring a mother who's a TV zombie and "a kind but spacey father." *Gossamer*, by Newbury Medal winner Lois Lowry, centers on a boy who has been "uprooted from his abusive home,"⁴ while the hero of Philip Womack's *The Other Book* is out from under his family because he lives at "a strict boarding school" that used to be a medieval manor until it was destroyed by another boy's "power-mad father."⁵ And let's not leave out the gem of them all, Philip Pullman's *His Dark Materials* trilogy, in which the heroine's mother and father can't seem to make up their minds whether to kill her or protect her: they are a pair of highly volatile characters.⁶

Providing the young protagonist with the freedom to undertake a death-defying quest is dictated by the needs of the story; but these authors go farther than they have to in order to accomplish this. We are left with a gallery of autonomous, powerful *children*—a frightening thought. An author who has written "Christian fantasy" comments:

"To me, the most corrupting idea—and one that is really fostered today—is the notion that the universe revolves around you, the individual. This form of self-centered narcissism is rampant throughout our culture, and it is basically the original satanic pride. Those who see themselves as gods cannot bring themselves to kneel before Jesus the Christ, because to do so is to violate their core self-image, Hedonism, sexual abuse, greed and even violence stem from the belief that your momentary desire is the only thing that truly matters."⁷

We see quite a lot of this in un-Christian fantasy.

POWER APART FROM GOD

2. Magical power (or any kind of power) exists apart from the will of a sovereign God and can be exercised by anyone who learns its secrets.

Here most fantasy makes a radical departure from the Bible. St. Paul's teaching, "For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God" (Rom. 13:1), has made no impression on these authors.

In *His Dark Materials*, Philip Pullman endows certain man-made objects with awesome powers—a "golden compass," a "subtle knife," and an "amber spyglass." Wielding these artifacts, a boy and a girl can divine "the truth," open up passages to parallel universes, and probe the innermost secrets of the cosmos. Although made by man, these gadgets have an agenda of their own—nothing less than rebellion against God, who, in Pullman's view, never created anything. If this sounds like idolatry to you, give yourself an "A" for discernment.



To a medieval man, an ordinary flashlight would have seemed like magic: he would have either feared it or coveted it, or both. But we know a flashlight isn't magic. It's just a rational application of discoverable, understandable elements and principles built into the universe by God when He created it.

"Magic" in fantasy usually involves a *supernatural* application of power. Magic circumvents the laws of nature and allows the mortal human being who uses it to function as a god. This is why some Christian thinkers have always been averse to fantasy.

"When men forsake God, fantasy replaces reality," R.J. Rushdoony writes. "Imagination here includes rational thought which is apostate and hence guilty of fantasy because it begins with man rather than God ... whereby man acts on the belief that sin can succeed and that God can be mocked. It included also the dangerous realm of fantasizing and reshaping the world after our imagination, which is what all sin attempts to do."⁸

Rushdoony is not suggesting that we should never use our imaginations. He isn't even saying we shouldn't write or read fiction. The real danger here is magic as a replacement for God and magical thinking that makes man his own God.

WORLDS WITHOUT GOD

3. There is no God active in the fantasy world.

As much as Harry Potter fans may argue that J.K. Rowling's viewpoint is "basically Christian," nowhere in these books does the author or any of her characters give God the glory or acknowledge that their magical power comes from Him.

A fantasy writer might have depicted it as a great feat of "magic" when Moses struck the rock with his staff and out poured a cascade of clean, fresh, badly needed water. When he did so, Moses said, "Hear now, ye rebels; must we fetch you water out of this rock?" (Num. 20:10).

But of course it was God, not Moses, who produced the water; and Moses sinned by speaking as if he were a magician. God punished him for it by not allowing him to cross over into the Promised Land.

His Dark Materials is unusual in being a three-volume rant against God. The usual practice is simply to ignore God. In this, fantasy novels resemble virtually everything else in our culture that falls into the category of "entertainment." And in this, "entertainment" resembles much of our business, our politics, our interpersonal transactions. A secularized society produces not only un-Christian fantasy novels, but un-Christian thought and action in every sphere of life.

4. There is no immutable moral law in the fantasy world: the characters determine good and evil for themselves. If there is no God, there simply can't be an immutable and transcendent moral law. The presence of such laws implies the existence of God, for such laws can only proceed from Him.

Philip Pullman comes closest to taking this to its logical conclusion. His protagonists are free to lie, cheat, or steal whenever they think it necessary. Harry Potter and his sidekicks are a little better behaved—although the last time I read a Harry Potter book, the only way I could tell which characters were supposed to be the good guys and which were supposed to be the villains was by the author's identi-

fying them as such.

Where, in the fantasy world, do good and evil come from, if not from God? In Lois Lowry's *Gossamer*, for instance, they come from magical entities who determine the content of sleeping humans' dreams:

"Finally, Little One and Thin Elderly infuse Johns and the woman's dreams with enough peace, love, and positive energy to enrich their souls and ward off negative thoughts, and the result is pure magic."⁹

Christians think you get those benefits from prayer, study of the Scriptures, sound and godly preaching, and communion with the Holy Spirit. But in most fantasy worlds, there's no God to pray to.

There's one more problem with all this fantasy, analyzed ably by Greg Clarke in *The Theologian*:

"It seems to me that a real evil in all this is found outside the books themselves. The merchandising these days surrounding any children's entertainment is overwhelming ... [I]t is in this area that harm may be done. Some of the games and toys push the magical dimension of Harry Potter beyond the story and into the everyday activities of children . . . They bring activities such as spell-casting and alchemy into the realm of play in a manner that might encourage some children to look further into such activities . . . It might be introducing some strange ideas about how the world operates that may be hard to shake in later life."¹⁰

Lindsay Harvey, of Mission America, takes the criticism farther than that. Her newly published book, *Not My Child*, blames the proliferation of occult-laden fantasy (among other causes) for an "explosion of radical pagan practices . . . among American children."¹¹

So we are talking about books—and their spin-offs in the form of movies, video games, toys, etc.—that offer young readers a worldview minus God and with parental authority removed from the equation, and a vision of children, who often feel (and, with good reason, are) powerless, wielding awesome magical powers. Is this really what we want Christian children to be reading?

CHRISTIAN FANTASY

Theodore Beale has written a Christian fantasy trilogy featuring "Eternal Warriors" participating in "The War in Heaven." In an interview with *World-Net Daily*, Beale tried to define Christian fantasy:

"Christian fantasy is fantasy fiction written from a worldview constructed around the idea that Jesus Christ is the Lord and Saviour of mankind, and is built from the premise that the universe generally operates as it is described in the Bible. Christianity is the starting point, and it lays the basic guidelines for the setting, but it does not dictate the direction in which the tale is told."¹³

C.S. Lewis' *Chronicles of Narnia*, seven books written from 1950-1956, are still the most famous and widely read "Christian fantasy" for young readers. It must be pointed out that even in these, some Christians may find problems. For instance:

"It's all in Plato, all in Plato, bless me, what *do* they teach them at these schools?"¹³

Many of us do not want to get all that close to Plato, a

INTELLIGENCE NEWSLETTERS

featuring: *Lessons in History*

by Pastor Earl F. Jones - *who published his newsletters every two months for almost 20 years with the heading of Christian Crusade for Truth. In 1989 a series called Lessons in History was included in the Jan-Feb '89 issue. That series became very popular with his subscribers. Pastor Jones was working on the Sep-Oct, 2001 issue when he passed away. Pastor Jones last newsletter was never published until now. The best way to understand the newsletters is to start with the Nov-Dec 1988 and read them in order from 1988 to 2001. Start now. \$10*



pagan philosopher with a pagan point of view. Nevertheless, we will use some examples from Narnia, and from J.R.R. Tolkien's works, too, to show how Christian fantasy ought to differ from un-Christian fantasy

1. Families should be at least normal, if not conspicuously loving and wholesome.

It will still be necessary for the Christian fantasy writer to put the young protagonists into situations in which they must act—but not as autonomous agents.

In the *Narnia* books, the children are separated from their parents by circumstances beyond their control; and when they arrive in the fantasy world of Narnia, they are anything but autonomous.

Instead, they are assigned missions by the Great Lion, Aslan—whom Lewis quite clearly identifies with Christ Himself. Those who deny this are being deliberately obtuse. The children have been removed from their parents' jurisdiction, but they remain under Christ's.

2. There should either be no "magic" at all in a Christian fantasy (in the usual sense of the word); or else whatever "magic" we find in the story is exercised by God Himself or by a deputy whom He expressly delegates the power.

We come back to Moses, who "did" many things that looked like magic (especially to the pagan Egyptians). In reality, all Moses did was to proclaim the power of God. It was God who put the plagues on Egypt, parted the Red Sea, sent manna down from heaven, and all the rest.

There are two kinds of "magic" in *Narnia*. There is the "deep magic," which God has built into creation itself, and which Aslan as the Son of God has authority to use. And there is a lower kind, and evil kind of magic, which can be used by the White Witch and her avatars (which are *not* human) for evil purposes. Aslan can undo the Witch's magic, but she can't undo his. And on those rare occasions when mortal human beings attempt to use magic independently (see the example of Uncle Andrew in *The Magician's Nephew*), they can't control it and they inevitably come to grief.

3. Even if God is not expressly mentioned in the story (and it's probably better that He should be), His existence and His lordship are implicit in the story.

This is how Tolkien is identified as a Christian writer. He never mentions God in either *The Hobbit* or *The Lord of the Rings* (he does in *The Silmarillion*), but God is seen as implicit in the story.

The good wizard, Gandalf, safely wields very powerful "magic." He can because he is a servant of God, who has given him the power. But the one-time greater wizard, Saruman, rebels against God and tries to set himself up as an independent power in the world. Saruman's humanistic use of magic turns out to be a poor, weak thing, totally unable to support his ambitions.

In Tolkien's tales the weak overthrow the strong, the foolish confound the wise, and even "base things of the world, and things which are despised" (1 Cor 1:28)—like the wretched Gollum—become powerful weapons in God's service. One might very easily see in *The Lord of the Rings* a novelistic presentation of the first chapter of First Corinthians.

4. In any Christian fantasy, there must be immutable moral law, which the characters only break at their peril.

In Lewis' stories, Aslan must always be obeyed; promises must be kept; lying, cheating, stealing, and murder are never options open to the protagonists; and the obligations of kinship and friendship must be honored. So, in *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader*, the children have to help their cousin Eustace when he's turned into a dragon, even though he's an obnoxious little twerp who's no use to anybody; and it's a good thing they do, because after he repents, Aslan heals him and he's able to take his place beside the others.

In *The Hobbit*, Bilbo cheats—to save his life—in a riddle contest with the evil Gollum. The toxic moral effects of this cheating come back to haunt the protagonist and continue to ripple outward in *The Lord of the Rings*. In the latter, the hero Boromir surrenders to the temptation to do evil in a good cause, and almost brings that good cause to total ruin. By contrast, Philip Pullman's young protagonists get ahead in life by lying and cheating: his ethic is purely situational.

CONCLUSION

Is it possible to write fantasy in which God the Father (or Christ the Son) is the sovereign Lord who must be obeyed? In which the family is a source of strength for the characters, and not a source of shame or weakness? In which "magic" is dispensed with altogether, or else revealed as just another aspect of God's power? In which blessings fall on those who keep God's Law, and curses on those who don't?

Lewis, Tolkien, and a few others have already made (some) strides in that direction. As long as there is a demand for young readers' fantasy ("It's good because it makes children want to read" has always been a Harry Potter selling point), it would seem that there is a need for Christian writers to provide fantasy that is God-honoring, Christ-centered, and profitable to

the development of the young reader's Christian worldview.

Notes:

1. Frances Hodgson Burnett, *The Secret Garden* (New York: Barnes and Noble Books, 2004), 221. Originally published in 1911, this classic children's fantasy shows that "magic" has long been included in the picture.

2. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harry_Potter
3. <http://www.teenreads.com/reviews/9780439871778.asp>. "Teenreads" provides reviews, descriptions, and synopses of dozens of new releases: an excellent resource.

4. <http://www.teenreads.com/reviews/9780385734165.asp>

5. <http://www.teenreads.com/reviews/9781599902012.asp>

6. See Chalcedon's review of this trilogy, <http://chalcedon.edu/articles/article.php?ArticleID=2811>.

7. Theodore Beale, http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=33951.

8. R.J. Rushdoony, *Institutes of Biblical Law*, vol.2 (Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 1982; 2001 edition), 546-547.

9. <http://www.teenreads.com/reviews/>

If you believe in a supernatural, evil god named "**Satan**" then you have accepted a pagan doctrine and are therefore a practicing idolator. If you believe in any other god than the God of Israel, then you are an idolator.

This pervasive 'Satan' doctrine has taken Christendom by storm. It has changed the way people read and perceive the Bible from Genesis through Revelation. It has changed the way people perceive God Himself. No doctrine in the history of Christendom has had a more debilitating effect upon man. No doctrine is in more urgent need of being re-examined and exposed. This book, and others like it, are needed in Christendom. The "Satan" doctrine has caused our people to stumble.

WHO THE DEVIL IS STATAN

sheds a welcome light on this "Lucifer" myth. *Ps Ben Williams*, from the foreword to the book. #509 @ sug don \$10.85



THE ROLE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE CHURCH

Rev. Brian M. Abshire

As I write this column, I am also celebrating (?) my 44th birthday. Middle age has come with an unexpected vengeance. Emotionally, I still think of myself as fairly young until reality confronts me every morning by the old man staring back at me out of the mirror. My manly red beard has more than a few strands of white in it these days, and the once bulging arm and shoulder muscles of my youth now seemed to have all migrated South around my mid-section. Just so I wouldn't miss the significance of the loss of youth, cards and letters have poured in from friends and family commiserating with me for reaching such an advanced age; my wife teases me about the inordinate amount of pink scalp peering through the crown of my head ("My, my Dear, looking a bit Benedictine these days, are we?") while my children warned me about not blowing out my birthday candles too hard lest my teeth fall out. And sadly, there is some measure of truth to these comments; though I am still vigorous enough to chase my wife around the house, when I finally catch her, by mutual agreement we usually decide that a good night's sleep is ample enough reward.

There is a relationship I think between our attitudes towards age, and our appreciation of the Old Testament. In our youth-oriented culture, age is often associated with obsolescence; what's new, is by definition superior. The broad evangelical Church right across the world has largely abandoned the Old Testament as anything other than the quaint musings of an old man not quite in touch with today's modern world. Consequently, while we may occasionally pay polite attention to his reminiscences, we do not really think he has anything of value to say. Right from the start, when the church imbibed deeply from the wells of Greek philosophy, there has been a problem both in understanding and applying the Old Testament. It has either been spiritualized away, or simply ignored. Old Testament religion is a gutsy, earthy, visceral faith that quite frankly, offends the sensibilities of Greek-influenced Christianity. Modern Christians are sundered from their past and ill-equipped for their future because they fail to understand the unity of the Scriptures.

Yet, New Testament Christianity sits on a pyramid of Old Testament religion. If you remove the foundation, then the capstone collapses. Without a proper understanding of the role and significance of the Old Testament, the Church is susceptible to every kind of error. The apostate, bland, ineffectual, culturally-compromised Church of today has

only to look at its rejection of the Old Testament to discover the source of many of its errors.

IN AUTHORITY 2 TIM. 3:16-17

When the Apostle Paul wrote to encourage Timothy in his duties, he says, "All Scripture was given by inspiration of God." Amazing that this verse, so often quoted as evidence of the authority of the Bible, is seldom understood in context. The Scriptures he was talking about here was NOT the New Testament (after all, it was still in the process of being written!) but rather what we call the Old Testament. The Bible for first century readers WAS the Old Testament and Paul consistently appeals to them as his source of authority. God had spoken to his church authoritatively and sufficiently through the Old Testament. They were sufficient to "make one wise unto salvation" (2 Tim 3:15) and therefore were to be revered, read, studied and applied. True, Jesus rebuked the traditions of men that had grown up around the Scriptures, but He fully affirmed their authority (Matt 5:17-19). Granted, the Old Testament spoke in shadows, types and figures and a great part of the New Testament revelation was designed to show the reality that the ancient writers only dimly glimpsed. But the fact is, one cannot understand New Testament revelation without understanding the Old Testament foundations. Hence, repeatedly, Paul appeals to the Old Testament to demonstrate the authenticity of his message.

In today's church, the authority of the Old Testament is either ignored, or so re-interpreted to be meaningless. I remember once a most painful sermon, preached by a friend of mine on Elijah and the Shummanite woman. She and her husband built and furnished him a little room on the top of her house. We then listened for a good hour about all the hidden, spiritual meanings behind the furniture (as I recall the bed represented rest in the Lord, the lamp for study, the chair for discipleship, etc.). But we never did hear about the necessity of hospitality. In other words, the CLEAR message is ignored and instead we are treated to men's imagination. The Old Testament is simply not allowed to speak for itself, and therefore the Church's foundations are undercut and destroyed.

IN WORSHIP; THE REGULATIVE PRINCIPLE

As much as I deeply appreciate our Puritan and Presbyterian ancestors, they must be understood in their historical context. Coming out of the corrupt Church of Rome, they struggled against the apostate, man-made religious practices that like weeds had choked out true worship in the church. As a consequence, it can be argued that they sometimes overreacted in their own theology of worship. It's almost as if they said, "If Rome did it, then it MUST be wrong" rather than develop a consistent Biblical view. Hence, while most Christians take for granted today singing hymns with musical accompaniment, this was utterly rejected by 17th century Reformers in Scotland and England; strict psalmody with no instruments was the rule. There are still a few brothers today who maintain this position, but in doing so, I fear that they have become operational Dispensationalists, demanding a radical break between Old Testament worship and New. Old Testament

exposé of a pagan doctrine

THE BIBLE DEVIL AND SATAN DEFINED

It is taught that the devil is a superhuman monster, a fallen angel, who dominates the minds of humanity, inducing mankind to sin. The teaching induces fear of the devil, and also provides an excuse for sin by blaming it on to him. The doctrine is not only unscriptural, but it is also a reflection upon God's love and omnipotence. Would a God of love allow weak, mortal man to be dominated by a powerful, depraved fallen angel if He has the strength to destroy him? And as God is omnipotent, why does He not rid Himself of the devil, if he be a fallen angel in heaven? Read and learn that the Bible teaches no such entity.

#403 @ sug don \$3.85



worship was replete with musical instruments of various kinds all making a joyful noise unto the Lord. I always find it a bit amusing to worship with my exclusive psalmody brethren, and while singing the Psalms with them, watch them pointedly ignore the commands to worship with stringed instrument, flute and lyre!

When Scripture enjoins us to clap our hands, or raise them in prayer, most Reformed people just wish those verses would go away because you see, if the Charismatics do it, then it **MUST** be wrong! And hence, a full-orbed worship service, demanding all of our strength and heart and soul is often missing, because we do not appreciate God's requirements for worship. Those commands cannot possibly be relevant today, because of course, we have never done it that way. "Can any good come out of Charismatics?" And we maintain this position even though there is not a shred of New Testament evidence that these practices somehow passed away with the establishment of the New Testament Church. A strong argument can be made that many Christians are drawn into the deviant theology of so many Charismatic churches, simply because their worship is so heartfelt, so vigorous, dare one say, "so Biblical." We ignore the Old Testament at our peril. As a friend of mine once noted, many Reformed Christians worship as if they were baptized in pickle juice.

IN POLITY: 1 TIM 3:1 ff

As a convinced Presbyterian, I believe that our form of government is the one ordained by God Himself (notice I said the **FORM** of government, not necessarily all the particulars). God's church is to be ruled by elders. This is very clear from 1 Tim 3:1ff, 5:14ff, etc. But this method of church government did not just spring full-blown from the Apostle Paul. In Acts 15 at the Jerusalem council, the Apostles and Elders were already ruling the Church. Where in the New Testament then do we find the specific instructions that this is the right form of government? Simple answer: nowhere. It just suddenly seems to appear! The reason of course is that the church is to be governed exactly the way that Israel was to be governed under Moses; by elders. Elders were to govern their homes, their families, their tribes, and ultimately the nation. Elders were to govern the Tabernacle and Temple. Elders governed the local synagogues [which is simply a meeting/place]. But you will not find this in the New Testament, it is found only in the Old. One cannot possibly understand, let alone rule God's church apart from the theological and practical basis laid out in the Old Testament. Bannerman, the classic Presbyterian apologist for church polity understood this and based his concepts on their Old Testament origins.

A related area is the way that elders were to be placed over the church. Presbyterians, at least in this country, have always elected their elders by the congregation. But in the two passages that actually teach on elders, they are to be appointed by Timothy and Titus. Think about this for a moment, especially you good Presbyterians. If we base our polity **ONLY** on the New Testament, then guess what, the two relevant Scriptural passages would seem, on the surface to support Episcopacy, rather than historic Presbyteri-

anism? However, if one finds the origins of Church government in the way that the congregation of Israel was to be ordered, then Jethro's advice to Moses allows an avenue of escape. The people were to elect their elders from the people. Moses then **ORDAINS** then to rule over the people. Hence when the Church is being organized, one can assume, because of testamental continuity, that a similar process was followed. When Paul therefore instructs elders to be "appointed" Timothy and Titus would then have followed the same procedure as ancient Israel; i.e. they would have gone to the congregation, asked them to select worthy men, and then, they would have been approved, appointed and ordained by the apostolic messengers. This in fact is very similar to the way that modern Presbyterians choose their church officers. Men are elected by the congregation, but ordained by the Session or the Presbytery.

Think about this; a subject near and dear to every pastor's heart is where his paycheck is coming from (and how much is in it!). While Paul does say that elders are worthy of a double honour (1 Tim 5:17) he bases their **RIGHT** to be paid for their ministry (as opposed to all the other ministries that people do for the church gratis) on the Old Testament Law regarding muzzling the ox. Hence the theological basis for paying leaders is not out of expediency, and not by direct command (though Jesus did say the "laborer is worthy of his hire") but rather on an obscure Old Testament reference to animal welfare!

But look what happens if we ignore the Old Testament basis. Pastors are either starved into submission (people will give money to anything in the church **EXCEPT** to pay most pastors a living wage) or the pastor becomes a vampire, sucking the life out of the church. There is no balance, because there is no theology of how much is enough [Tithing?!?!?]. Broad evangelicals do not know the theology and therefore they pervert the practice (how would you like to submit **YOUR** tax returns to the church so everyone can criticize how you have spent the Lord's money? You think I am joking?).

The point here of course is that the New Testament, in and of itself, does not and cannot form the foundation of the doctrine of the Church. Without the Old Testament, we are left in a morass of subjective opinion, with no clear basis for developing a Biblical church polity.

IN VISION MATT 28:19-20

One of the first verses I was required to memorize years ago when I was involved with a para-church ministry, was the Great Commission of Matthew 28:19-20. Evangelism and discipleship were the lifeblood of this ministry and we were all expected to share a "simple" explanation of the gospel and then when people prayed the prayer with us, "disciple" them by taking them through one of those fill-in-the-blank bible study booklets. Even with all the simplistic theology and practice that this method represents, it is still **LIGHT-YEARS** ahead of where the average broad evangelical church is. At least we took these verses seriously and were personally committed to doing something about them. The average broad evangelical is quite happy leaving the Great Commission to the Bible geeks and four-eyes girls



with sensible shoes who want to go to the mission field.

Neither the modern church nor the para-church can either adequately understand or fulfill the Great Commission because they do not acknowledge the Old Testament background. Jesus was not doing something new here, He was not instituting some radical new program for the Great Commission is simply the dominion mandate of Genesis 1:27 all over again! We are to fill the earth and subdue it, not just through natural generation, but by evangelism [among those of our family and relatives who have backslidden and turned away in rebellion]. Furthermore, it is not just the add branch plucked from the fire, instead, it is entire nations [a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee, CIM] that are to be disciplined to obey Jesus. In the Great Commission we simply have the final statement on how the original Covenant of Creation is to be fulfilled. It is a resounding postmillennial commission, implicitly assuming that as the church goes forth and depends on the sovereign power of the resurrected and ascended Christ, that our enemies will be converted, the nations subdued, and that every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.

Therefore the church cannot know who she is, where she is going, or even what she is supposed to be apart from understanding her Old Testament roots [the church in the wilderness]. Without the Old Testament, the church is susceptible to every kind of error and heresy. There is no doubt in my mind, that the current deplorable state of the church is directly attributable to her abandonment of truly Biblical religion. hey folks, there are no "New Testament" churches; there are only Biblical ones. And that means understanding and applying what the WHOLE Bible says, not just a few bits here and there.

<http://highlands-reformed.com/otchurchauthority.html>

My Two Cents from Paul Harvey DOES MY PRAYING OFFEND YOU

I don't believe in Santa Claus, but I'm not going to sue somebody for singing a Ho-Ho-Ho song in December. I don't agree with Darwin, but I didn't go out and hire a lawyer when my high school teacher taught his theory of evolution. Life, Liberty or your pursuit of happiness will not be endangered because someone says a 30-second prayer before a football game.

So what's the big deal? It's not like somebody is up there reading the entire book of Acts. They're just talking to a God they believe in and asking Him to grant safety to the players on the field and fans going home from the game. But it's a Christian prayer, some will argue.

Yes, and this is the United States of America, a country

founded on Christian principles. According to our own phonebook, Christian churches outnumber all others better than 200-to-1. So what would you expect —somebody chanting Hare Krishna?

If I went to a football game in Jerusalem, I would expect to hear a Jewish prayer. If I went to a soccer game in Baghdad, I would expect to hear a Muslim prayer. And if I went to a ping-pong match in Taiwan, I would expect to hear someone pay homage to Buddha. And I wouldn't be offended. It wouldn't bother me one bit. When in Rome . . .

"And don't forget about the atheists." . . . What about them? Nobody is asking them to be baptized. We're not going to pass the collection plate. Just humor us for 30 seconds. If that's asking too much, bring a Walkman or a pair of ear plugs. Go to the bathroom. Visit the concession stand. Call your lawyer!

Unfortunately, one or two will make that call. One or two will tell thousands what they can and cannot do. I don't think a short prayer at a football game is going to shake the world's foundations.

Christians are just sick and tired of turning the other cheek while our courts strip us of all our rights. Our parents and grandparents taught us to pray before eating; to pray before we go to sleep. Our Bible tells us to pray without ceasing. Now a handful of people and their lawyers are telling us to cease praying.

God, help us!

And if that last sentence offends you, well . . . just sue me.

Paul Harvey is an extremely popular nationally syndicated commentator.

"Only the LORD had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and He chose their seed after them, even you above all people, as it is this day." (Deut 10:12-15)

Here we are at the end of June, with another half year gone. We have all been hit pretty hard with fuel prices, and our expenses continue to escalate. Sorry about the delay with some of

the back-orders. Some are being reprinted, and others are on their way from overseas. A printer breakdown costing \$500 also caused some delays. The girls are also having less time available to spend on taking care of the mail, due to working; we apologise for delays.

Our sincere thanks to all who continue to write, order, and support us. We could not continue without your support. Thanks also to those who continue to work at getting more readers - it is much appreciated. May our Heavenly Father, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob bless you and keep you and make His face shine on you and give you His peace, for your faithfulness

