



# Christian Identity Ministries

A member of the  
Congregations of Israel

PO Box 146, CARDWELL QLD 4849, Australia

Ph: 07-4066 0146 (International 61-7 instead of 07) [www.christianidentityministries.com](http://www.christianidentityministries.com) - [hr\\_cim@bigpond.com](mailto:hr_cim@bigpond.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!*

#280

## Covenant Messenger

August AD2009

(a publication of N.Q. Fellowship of God's Covenant People)

### “WHY EVEN ATHEISTS SHOULD SUPPORT CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION”

by Pastor Brian Abshire

When we bring up the very topic of “Christian Civilization” one can almost immediately hear the howls of outrage from the secular humanists, socialists, materialists and atheists. They will scream “*separation of church and state*” even though this phrase is not in the Constitution and early politicians had no problems with the Federal government paying congressional and military chaplains, endorsing religious schools, or individual States having an established religion.

The “stated” reasons for their concern are a fear of religious bigotry that “imperils” personal freedom, prosperity, and safety. How often have you read various pundits compare the Religious Right with Militant Islamic Fascism or the horrors of the “Crusades?” Modern western academics, politicians and writers supposedly HATE the very idea of “Christian Civilization” because they “fear” the “dire” consequences that religion’s “blood-stained history” proves.

Just for the sake of argument, let us take the atheist’s “fears” about Christian civilization seriously for a moment and examine them. Would a consistently Christian culture (not a perfect one mind you, just a consistent one) result in a top-down religious dictatorship, equipped with secret police who enforce “Christian” morality, oppressing dissent and engaging in religious warfare?

First, a widespread acceptance of and adherence to Christian morality means a strong family which means less crime, welfare, etc. (Please read this essay from WorldNetDaily: [www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\\_ID=32665](http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=32665)).

Studies and surveys have repeatedly shown that the people MOST at risk of becoming delinquents, criminals or institutionalized into multigenerational poverty are those from broken homes. Divorce, it seems, is hazardous to your children's future. Children from stable, intact two-parent families are far more productive, responsible and stable members of society than those from fractured families. Crime rates for white and black families are about the same, when compared on the basis of whether the family is intact (black crime rates are higher, just because so often there is not a father in the home—but white families without a father are just as likely to create dysfunctional children as black families). Yet, though divorce is far too common in Christian homes these days, the divorce rate is still far lower than for “non-Christian” homes. Therefore, there is a direct relationship between committed Christians, and a committed marriage. The more stable the marriage,

the more intact the family. And the more intact the family, the more lawful, responsible and sober citizens they raise. Wow, there does not seem to be a lot to fear from Christian civilization here, does there?

Secondly, Christian moral standards taught in the home means that values such as integrity, honesty, loyalty, etc., are reinforced in the broader community, which means you can trust your banker not to steal your money, your insurance salesman not to sell you useless and unnecessary “protection” just to make an extra buck at your expense, or your car dealer not to sell you a lemon.

The atheist or humanist of course will object as partisanship our claims here; are we AREALLY saying that only Christian are virtuous people? What about all the Swaggarts and Bakkers and Elmer Gantries in the world? Well, true enough; many Christians are inconsistent with their own religious beliefs, but where does one get the idea in the first place of over-arching moral values that transcend personal self-interest in the first place? For years, our universities have been indoctrinating young students into the “religious” belief that there are no absolute moral values. And if people believe that, then why SHOULD they

#### IN THIS ISSUE:

Why Even Atheists Should Support Christian, .....	1
Thou Shalt Have No Other Gods Before Me, .....	3
Pediatrics, .....	5
Tithing and the Kingdom, .....	7
Christian Politics: Towards a Christian Culture, .....	8
Bible Preaching Churches: Cut of from .....	9
But What About Deborah? .....	10
Eye Contact With Big Brother, .....	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!

CIM reserves the right to edit submitted or reprinted material in line with CIM editorial policy. CIM does the utmost to ensure that the spirit of articles remains intact at all times.

tell the truth, keep their promises, pay their bills or act responsibly? We would argue that humanists are only “virtuous” by being inconsistent with their own philosophical suppositions. After all, Hitler, Stalin, and the Marquis de Sade were simply consistent humanists; with no source of morality about the individual, right by definition becomes whatever those with the power decide.

Thankfully, most humanist Americans are not consistent with their underlying moral philosophy; would you really want to live next door to someone who really believed and acted on his belief that there were no higher morals truths other than one’s own will? Atheists and materialists may ridicule, deride or act condescendingly towards those “benighted” “narrow-minded” Christians; but where else will he find neighbours who respect his right to life, property and reputation as a part of their religious view of life? Right now, humanists fear Christian influence because it might impede their “right” to kill their unborn children. But what about when your children want to terminate YOUR life because keeping you alive is just too expensive - or inconvenient? In a few years time, the average atheist just might appreciate those Christian “right to life” groups protecting HIS right not to be turned off life-support or used as a medical guinea pig.....

Thirdly, Christian concepts of justice and jurisprudence means that criminals are inhibited, keeping you safer. In a “Christian” culture there really are things that are right and wrong and men are held responsible for their actions, AFTER a fair and equitable determination of the facts. Even liberals wring their hands in despair over the outrageous humanist penal system in this country; but they have nothing better to offer in its place. In a “Christian” culture, morality is both encouraged, and immorality (as in theft, murder, rape, etc.) is inhibited by severe sanctions.

Nobody likes the present system where criminals are basically told to “stand in a corner and think about what you’ve done” when convicted of a crime. But they have nothing better to offer. All the psychotherapy, all the self-help groups, all the money spent in incarcerating felons at taxpayer’s expense is widely recognized as a waste. Furthermore, it is a standing joke that our penal system allows convicted felons to become brutalized by their fellow criminals. Prisons just make bad people worse!

In a “Christian” society, murderers, rapists and child-molesters are not released to repeat their crimes over and over again because Biblical law seeks to eliminate criminals as a class. Most people would rather not know that the vast majority of crimes are committed by recidivists who will be convicted, imprisoned and released over and over again. But in a Christian culture, these wicked people would pay the ultimate temporal penalty for their crimes, and therefore hundreds of thousands of victims would be spared. But humanists seem more concerned about the criminals than the victims.

Fourthly, the humanists, materialists and atheists fear a Christian state, because they fear what that state might do to THEM. They want to commit adultery, enjoy homosexuality or murder their unborn children without having to face criminal sanctions. They know that if Christians are successful in winning the culture, many of their favourite pastimes would be illegal, just as they have been criminalized since the conversion of Rome in 325 AD. Humanists are willing to see the entire culture slide into destruction or tyranny, just to maintain their right to sin without legal or

moral sanctions.

However, in reality, a Biblically founded Republic restricts the power of civil magistrates severely. Christian political government begins with the assumption of self-government. Only a very limited amount of authority is granted to the state; therefore the power of the State to oppress ANYONE is severely retarded. A Christian State has limited power, and limited money; it cannot afford a “secret police” to peek into people’s bedrooms.

Atheists often want the freedom to sin without the government monitoring or interfering with their activities. They fear a Christian Republic because they assume the government, backed by the power of the “sword” will use that power against them. While it is true that a Christian culture will legislate against certain forms of immorality it does not have the power to do anything except act against the PUBLIC display of immorality. What happens in private stays in private. The average citizen therefore can live their life, even an immoral one without fear of a police state, because the government has neither the power, NOR the financial resources to investigate, let alone, oppress or persecute anyone.

Fifthly, Christian economic principles mean that hard work, thrift and frugal living bring about long-term wealth which in turn, benefits everyone in the society. The more that people are rewarded for self-government, and not penalized for their hard work and frugal living; the more money is available for investment, consumption and charity therefore increasing the wealth for EVERY member of society. The Westminster Confession actually states that it is a religious duty for Christians to increase their own wealth, and the wealth of their neighbour! If the individual is allowed to keep more of his own income he has every incentive to use

it as productively as possible, investing in more businesses, providing more jobs and economic opportunities for all.

Finally, Christian political principles means that limited government cannot use their authority to manipulate the market or give big businesses unfair advantages. Since under a Christian consensus, the civil magistrate has very limited power and few financial resources, the power of the state cannot be bought by the wealthy to increase their own wealth. Power flows from the citizens, who have every incentive to keep the people in “power” accountable. Monopolies are therefore easily subverted by men finding creative alternatives, thus increasing product availability and decreasing costs for everyone. (copyrights and patents are forms of monopolizing)

And of course, there are other advantages. Christian societies have ALWAYS been the freest, most prosperous cultures. But, the humanist will answer back, what about religious persecution and wars, such as the Crusades!

Let us take a look at that oft repeated argument; one that has been around since the 17th century when Europe was being torn apart by “religious” wars; wars that had as much to do with economics, political power and the growth of nationalism as it did with religion. During the Crusades, small armies consisting of just a few thousand soldiers engaged other professional armies of a few thousand soldiers over several centuries of warfare for religious reasons. It was warfare and warfare is always ugly; even when fought for the highest motives and by the most virtuous means. yet, how “terrible” and “shocking” that these “Christians” would fight and die over various definitions of

### **New Video:**

### **Expounding on God’s Law**

Jay Nauss

*Jay speaking at the Inverell Forum, on God’s Law for society today. How it would solve some serious problems overnight if it were administered. Crime would grind to a halt - and every one would be so much happier with their non-taxable, non-rateable land, and reduced taxation.*

**DVD#CI-691 @ sug don \$5**



“God?” Surely that is enough to disqualify Christians from ever being in power again, right?

However, the truth is a little more complicated. First, one has to remember that the Medieval Crusades came after five hundred years of Islamic invasions of Europe; invasions that did not end until the 17th century! Islam began in the seventh century and over-ran Christian nation after Christian nation. So, before we start laying all the blame on Christianity for the Crusades, let us be honest and admit that these were wars of self-defense.

However, more to the point is that in the 20th century alone, humanists, materialists and atheists have directly been responsible for hundreds of millions of deaths in the name of socialism, communism or fascism. Abortion in America has murdered somewhere near 50 million babies since 1973. What has been done in the “name of the people” in this century alone far outweighs whatever has been done “in the name of God” in the past. The honest humanist will admit this; the dishonest one will keep harping on the Crusades or the Inquisition in hopes that no one will pay attention to the concentration camps, gulags or “re-education” centers created and manned by humanists that have devastated whole nations. So which system of thought is really more dangerous to the average person; Christianity which conducted a series of defensive wars against hostile aggressive invaders five hundred years ago which at best involved a few thousand professional soldiers, or consistently humanistic States that have murdered hundreds of millions in the past 100 years?

So with all things going for Christian civilization, a culture that would be freer, more prosperous and safer even for atheists and humanists, why would they really be against a Christian civilization?

Well, here is the dirty little secret the God-haters do not want to talk about. Materialism, humanism and atheism are rival worldviews to Christianity; just as religious as the most uneducated “Bible-thumper” handling snakes and drinking poison in some little church in Appalachia. Humanists believe in the power of Man, rather than God, and therefore have a religious conviction that the State, as the supreme expression of man’s power on earth ought to govern every area of life. No matter that socialism destroys the wealth of a society or that humanism destroys the freedom of a society, or that atheism destroys the morality of a society; they refuse to see, because their own religious blinders are firmly set.

“Professing to be wise, they became fools” Paul said to the Romans. When men worship anything other than the one true god the inevitable result is depraved thinking and social chaos. But humanists and atheists have a religious conviction that the world must operate according to THEIR standards, not God’s. Therefore, while they want the fruits of Christian civilization, they also must deny its roots, because otherwise, they would have to repent and acknowledge Jesus Christ as Lord. Like Alice’s Red Queen, they practice believing six impossible things before breakfast, because opening their eyes would mean realizing that their “solutions” to social problems only make things worse.

So I do not expect many atheists, humanists or materialists reading this to come on board the Christian civilization band-wagon even though Christianity is the BEST guarantee that they could live safely, freely and prosperously. But as they say on the “X-Files” the truth is out

there; if they are only willing to receive it.

And eventually, as God gives grace, and the current generation grows old and gray, as they fail to reproduce themselves because they murdered their own children (or **refused to even have any** in the first place [which in reality is the **same mindset**]) a new generation will arise who will see the flaws of Humanism. That new generation, living sober, self-governed lives, staying married to their spouses, raising godly, self-controlled children who work hard, save and invest for the future, will one day inherit this nation, and eventually the entire planet. And a hundred, or a thousand, or even ten thousand years from now, there will be a new crop of God-haters of various sorts who will enjoy the blessing of a land blessed with freedom, safety and prosperity, and still curse God under their breath. Let us just pray that our descendants learn from our folly and refuse to listen to them, and lose again, what we lost and are now struggling to regain.

Courtesy International Institute for Christian Culture

<http://christian-civilization.org/atheistssupport.html>

A number of those “old and gray” have passed away, and again we are not seeing the next generation picking up the ball to run with it. **Please, the next generation is the most valuable asset in seeking first His Kingdom and its righteousness**, therefore it is vitally important to make sure that they carry on where you left off. Encourage your ‘next generation,’ and perhaps also your grandchildren (the generations to come) to also seek first God’s Kingdom and not be carried off with the “cares of this world” and also encourage them to continue with this newsletter subscription. They are far more important than your friends and neighbours, which you try to influence, remember that! Do you want your children to do well in Babylon, which will fall—or in God’s Kingdom, which will stand forever??

## THOU SHALT HAVE NO OTHER GODS BEFORE ME by Bret McAtee

“Every child entering school at the age of five is insane because he comes to school with certain allegiances to our founding fathers, towards our elected officials, toward his parents, toward a belief in a supernatural being, and toward the sovereignty of this nation as a separate entity. It’s up to you as teachers to make all these sick children well—by creating the international child of the future.” [Psychiatrist Chester M. Pierce, addressing 1973 Childhood International Education Seminar]

Despite the pagan educator’s explicit intent to indoctrinate children into a worship of the state, Christians continue to send their children to government schools. Some Christians believe that their local schools are different because the teachers there are ‘nice’ and maybe even ‘smart.’ What they fail to realize is that ‘nice’ and ‘smart’ are buzzwords used in service of the reprogramming of children—often without the nice and smart teachers being themselves aware of the malevolent design of government schooling to program and indoctrinate their children into a pagan statist religion.

The most effective reprogramming is done with a smile on the teacher’s face. The Christian community has to realize that the Christian teachers in the school system to which they are sending their children have yoked themselves to a system that is at war with Biblical Christianity. Further, we must realize that the Christianity of ‘Christian’ teachers is



either a Christianity that is in abeyance or a Christianity that has been reinterpreted to fit the mold of the humanistic agenda of the government schools in which they are employed. A Christian teacher who taught his subject matter from a Biblically Christian worldview in a humanistic school system would be fired in weeks if not days. Government schools are not populated by the kind of Christians who can help your children think God's thoughts after Him.

Government schools are committed to the religion of humanism, where man is considered either individually or collectively as the god of that system. The man-centered idolatry of humanism is so obvious that government schools really ought to be considered churches. Just as Christian fathers in concert with Christian churches are charged with teaching children to think as Christians through catechizes, so the government schools are charged with teaching children to think as humanists through their lessons.

In the church of humanism, the teachers are the ministers. In the church of humanism, the curriculum of its schools is the equivalent to the catechism in the church of Christianity. In the church of humanism, there are high holy days, which its adherents celebrate, just as Christian churches have their own high holy days that they celebrate. In the churches of humanism, people can be expelled for sinning against humanistic rules of political correctness just as in Christian churches people can be excommunicated for sins against the Christian faith. All the dynamics that one finds in Christian churches and in the Christian faith are present in government schools. Government schools are temples of humanism where the initiates are indoctrinated in the ways of a false religion. Don't let anyone say that the people don't have an established religion.

Let's briefly examine some of these claims and see if we can find evidence from those who are associated with government education to support this premise.

#### **MORE THAN READING, WRITING AND ARITHMETIC**

When considering whether government schools are committed to the religion of humanism, we read from Charles Potter, a former honorary president of the National Education Association:

"Education is thus a most powerful ally of humanism, and every American school is a school of humanism. What can a theistic Sunday school's meeting for an hour once a week and teaching only a fraction of the children do to stem the tide of the five-day program of humanistic teaching?"

(Charles F. Potter, *Humanism; A New Religion*, 1930).

When considering whether teachers are the ministers of humanism, we learn from humanist John Dunphy:

"I am convinced that the battle for humankind's future must be waged and won in the public school classroom by teachers that correctly perceive their role as proselytizers of a new faith: a religion of humanity that recognizes and respects the spark of what theologians call divinity in every human being ... The classroom must and will become an arena of conflict between the old and new. These teachers must embody the same selfless dedication as the most rabid fundamentalist preachers, for they will be ministers of another sort, utilizing the classroom instead of a pulpit to convey humanist values in whatever subject they teach, regardless of the educational level—preschool day care or large state universities." (The Humanist, Jan/Feb 1983).

When we combine Dunphy's quote with a quote from the father of outcome-based education, Benjamin Bloom, we begin to see that Dunphy's vision fits well within the vision of those who are 'shaping' public education:

"By educational objectives, we mean explicit formulations of the ways in which students are expected to be changed by the educative process. That is, the ways in which they will change in their thinking, their feelings, and their actions." (Taxonomy—Handbook I, p.26).

When considering how the nature of the curriculum serves the ends of religious humanism, we have only to read from Dr. John I. Goodlad, former director of research and development at the Institute for Development of Educational Activities, who many years ago wrote that future curriculum 'will be what one might call the humanistic curriculum.' Looking forward to the future, Goodlad could say that his humanistic curriculum would 'become significantly evident by 1990 or 2000.' (NEA Journal, 'Directions of Curriculum Change,' March 1966).

#### **OUTCOME-BASED EDUCATION AND ITS ROTTEN FRUIT**

The idea that government schools are in reality government churches is not only supported by the quotes I've provided thus far, but perhaps the best support for this claim

can be seen by the overall structural methodology that informs the world of government education. This structural methodology is named **Outcome-Based Education (OBE)**.

OBE is anchored in anti-Christian behavioral psychology and is committed to inculcating a particular socio-political agenda that guides the student to adopt an anthropocentric value system based upon the precepts of pagan humanistic psychology. This stands in contrast to a Christian worldview, or a worldview based upon historic categories arising out of Western civilization. When the government schools use OBE as the methodology that structures their teaching, the result is to indoctrinate students who favor group-think over individualism,

socialism over free-market competition, and subjective oriented ethics over ethics that are transcendent. The end is the humanist 'new man' who has been taught to prefer egalitarian conformity and is prone to faulting individuals oriented toward industry and achievement. All of this is accomplished by manipulating students by means of emotive control. In OBE mind control, solid academics are thrown out in favour of pursuing self-esteem, being 'self-directed,' and achieving 'process skills.' OBE is dedicated to creating a culture of slavery.

In light of this very small sampling, and given that the first commandment forbids us to serve other gods, why do Christians send their covenant children to government schools? Why do Christians send their and God's children to an institution where they are immersed in learning the covenant ways of a false religion? Further, why are Christians surprised when their children, upon maturity, abandon the Christian faith? Having saturated them in the belief system of humanism, why would we expect them to be unfaithful to humanism? One reason why our children leave the church is because by placing them in government schools, we train them to be pagans.

**ANTICIPATED OBJECTION #1—Education is A-Religious.**

Most 'Christian' teachers employed by government

**Old Historic Videos:  
AMERICA'S STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES - Everett Ramsey  
GOD GIVE US THE SPIRIT OF OUR FOREFATHERS - Pete Peters - this really is a first class classic!  
DIABOLICAL DUPLICITY - Lindsay Williams & Jonathan May about the money manipulation  
DVD#CI-084 @ sug don \$15**

-----  
**Thomas Schumann  
Life of a KGB Propaganda Agent +  
A Chilling Talk with a KGB Defector  
DVD#CI-085 @ sug don \$15**



schools are not self-conscious about their contribution to building an anti-Christian culture in the way that they are teaching children. These teachers are too often Christian only in the sense of embracing a particular religious brand identity. Unfortunately, these 'Christian' teachers have never had the opportunity to probe and examine the presuppositions that form the curriculum they are teaching and have accepted as their own.

Some would object to this by positing that education does not need to be specifically Christian since education is not spiritual but only intellectual. The objection reasons that education is not religious; that education is one of the disciplines that falls within a 'creational common realm' where both Christians and non-Christians labor together, in spite of significant differences in presuppositions. These folks insist that education is to be done not by the standards of God's Word, but rather by the standard of natural law. They believe that God's Word doesn't teach anything with regard to the disciplines one might expect to find in a liberal arts education. The truths of these disciplines, in their view, are taught by natural law and are self-evident.

But this is a peculiar minority reading raised only by some Re-formed Christians. Other adherents of other faith systems understand perfectly well the importance of an education in keeping with their faith. This is why we can find people of other non-Christian faiths insisting on the importance of an education that is in keeping with their beliefs.

"He alone, who owns the youth, gains the future." Adolf Hitler

"Give me your 4-year-olds, and in a generation I will build a socialist state" Vladimir Lenin.

Even were we to concede that education is not a spiritual discipline, we still have to come to grips with which metaphysical, epistemological, teleological, and axiological starting points should be presupposed in the educational process. Education always presupposes some theological order as standard. So even agreeing that education belongs to a spiritually undifferentiated common realm, we must still ask, in the midst of many disputes in a pluralistic culture, which starting points will be presumed as the context in which the various educational disciplines find their meaning? The real issue is determining which regime's creation order will be presupposed. Obviously, if Christians agree that education is an 'undifferentiated common realm project,' then all Christians absolutely must agree that that project will explicitly and implicitly center on no other God than the God of the Bible who alone can provide the starting points that can render the educational disciplines rational.

**ANTICIPATED OBJECTION #2—Keep The Schools Secular**

A second objection by Christians who do not object to placing their children in government schools is that public schools do not teach humanist beliefs any more than they teach any other belief. The schools, so the thinking goes, are simply secular and neutral, neither promoting nor demeaning religion. Therefore, any calls for Christians to pull their children from government schools are unwarranted.

But teachers can't teach in a presuppositional vacuum; they must educate according to some perspective, worldview, or philosophical paradigm—and this paradigm, because it descends from a theological system of belief, is

inherently religious. As we have noted, the worldview of government schools, regardless of any insistence to the contrary, is humanism.

### THE END OF THE MATTER

Christians are commanded to set no other gods before them. When Christians send their children to those schools—in spite of what they know about their humanist indoctrination—they are worshipping at the altar of humanism. There is simply no other way to put it. There may be rare exceptions, but as a whole, government schools are committed to sanitizing the Christian faith of those who enter their doors.

Many Christians have been praying for reformation and religious awakening. If we genuinely desire this, we must immediately stop sending our children to government schools, looking for reformation in our culture while at the same time immersing our children in a belief system that is at war with Christianity is a very odd way to prepare for reformation and religious awakening. Indeed, it is extraordinarily difficult to understand how prayers for reformation and awakening will be answered by God as long as God's people continue to disobey God and poison their children's

minds against Christ by sending them to government schools. Certainly we can say that one sign of reformation and awakening in the church will be Christian parents removing their covenant seed from humanist schools, thus taking the first commandment seriously again.

[Courtesy Faith for All of Life - Light of Life - [www.chalcedon.edu](http://www.chalcedon.edu)]

### PEDIATRICS

*Peter Frogley, adapted from Joel Robbins*

Pediatrics, or the care of young children, traditionally entails the care of the child from shortly after birth until about age sixteen.

It is important not to be too stressed about a child developing 'according to the book,' as children develop at their own unique pace. Being aware of this can prevent much parental anxiety.

Development charts have their place in identifying blatant development deficiencies to allow proper care to be taken as early as possible. As all parents are aware, there are unique health issues that seem to strike all or at least most of our children.

### NORMAL CHILDHOOD DISEASES

There is really no such thing as a 'normal' disease, regardless of how common it is. A better description would be 'common childhood diseases.' The body is not designed to be sick, but due to wrongdoings and other influences experienced by a majority of the population, many illnesses are common. In too many cases our diseases are well earned.

If we are honest with our selves and look at the research that has been expended on behalf of these 'normal childhood diseases' and the great strides medical science has made, we must ask the same question as Harry Beiler, MD:

"Why then are the offices of the country's thousands of pediatricians and general practitioners filled with runny-nosed, tired, allergic, feverish, rundown, anemic, bespectacled, acne-ridden, too thin or obese children?"

If the childhood diseases are normal, why doesn't every child get them? Why do they bypass some, only for those children to fall victim to cancer, diabetes or some other degenerative disease?



## FROM THE PRODUCTION LINE

Children should be born with a totally healthy and toxic-free body (bearing in mind that there is no perfection in this sin-ridden world).

This health should remain as their mother nurses them while consuming only a naturally right diet. As children begin consuming naturally right solids their body will remain in health.

Unfortunately, many mothers, often unwittingly have developed faulty eating habits and their child is born toxic. Often the newborn's intestine is full of meconium—a black, oxidized, toxic bile. This tells us that the child's liver has already had a good workout and is in the beginning stages of toxicity.

A far too common scenario is that as children begin to grow they are fed poisoned mother's milk, or an artificial substance that resembles milk only in appearance. When they begin eating solid food, they are fed toxin-laden substances having little or no nutritious value.

The body of this child, which is still full of vitality, will attempt with all its might to push these toxins out of its system using any vicarious avenue it can. In is this situation we have come to accept and thus call various conditions 'normal childhood diseases.'

### THE LIST OF DISEASES

Dr. Robbins lists and then describes what happens with each disease.

#### MEASLES

A contagious viral disease affecting mucous membranes and skin.

Measles is the vicarious elimination of toxins via upper respiratory and sinus membranes as well as skin. The measles virus sets up housekeeping in the toxic debris of the mucous membranes, setting the fever mechanism in motion.

#### CHICKEN POX

An acute illness thought to be contagious and caused by a virus affecting mainly the skin, producing eruptions.

Chickenpox is the vicarious elimination of toxins via the skin, primarily the oil producing glands of the skin. The chickenpox virus sets up housekeeping in the toxic debris, putting in motion the fever mechanism.

#### MUMPS

Infection and inflammation of the salivary glands, usually the parotid gland.

Mumps is caused by toxic accumulation in the salivary glands which gives license for the infective virus to set up housekeeping, resulting in fever and the accompanying feverish symptoms.

#### EAR INFECTIONS

Infection of the middle ear causing pain and fever.

Toxins are vicariously eliminated via the mucus membranes of the middle ear. Because this mucous is laden with toxins it is thicker than normal and as a result it does not drain efficiently through the eustachian tube into the throat.

The mucous builds up inside the middle ear, putting pressure on the ear drum and causing pain.

(Dietary advice: Eliminate all dairy products (except butter), eliminate wheat and corn.

#### SINUS INFECTIONS

Mucous drainage on a chronic basis usually with no fever or other acute symptoms.

Caused by the vicarious elimination via mucous membranes of the sinus cavities. In some cases bacteria set up house in which case the thicker white to yellow mucous is produced. The presence of the scavenger may set off the fever mechanism. If mucous is thinner and clear an infective organism is not present. The buildup of mucous and inflammation of the mucous membranes can produce pressure in the sinus cavities, causing a sinus headache.

#### TONSILLITIS

Inflammation of the tonsils and throat area resulting in a sore throat.

Tonsillitis is caused by the tonsils and adenoids becoming enlarged when the lymphatic system becomes congested. Congestion of the lymphatic system results when the liver is too congested to process the waste products and

toxins the lymphatic system has picked up from the cells of the body. In an effort to overload the blood stream and liver the lymphatic system accumulates the toxins in the lymph nodes. These temporary storage sites become inflamed. Because of the stagnant accumulation of toxins in the lymph node (tonsils) bacteria can set up housekeeping, resulting in an infection.

#### ACUTE RESPIRATORY DISORDERS—CROUP, BRONCHITIS AND PNEUMONIA

These all involve the same basic mechanism as far as their cause; the symptoms varying slightly based on which part of the respiratory tract is carrying out the vicarious elimination.

**Croup** involves the mucous membranes of the throat, larynx and bronchial tubes.

Bronchitis is the inflammation and toxic mucous production of the mucous membranes of the bronchial portion of the respiratory tract.

**Pneumonia** the vicarious elimination via the mucous membranes in the alveolar or air sacs in the lungs.

These conditions are caused by the vicarious elimination of toxins via the mucous membranes of the respiratory tract. With the resultant inflammation of the mucous membrane the air passages are hindered, resulting in difficulty breathing.

The cough reflex is set in motion as a result of the abnormal mucus production in an effort to eliminate it from the lungs. Should a bacteria or virus set up housekeeping in the toxic debris, the fever mechanism will be engaged.

The liver can become involved in the elimination process resulting in nausea, vomiting and/or diarrhea.

## Library Builder: CROSS EXAMINATION by Malcolm Ross

*The information presented in this book deals with a landmark Freedom of Expression case. It began as a Human Rights Board of Inquiry and progressed through the legal system from the Court of Queen's Bench and the New Brunswick Court of Appeal, all the way to the Supreme Court of Canada. It is presently under investigation by the Human Rights Committee of the United Nations at Geneva, Switzerland. The reader will discover the evidence upon which Malcolm Ross was judged, and how a powerful lobby exerted its tremendous influence to ensure that his Christian perspective of history and theology would be quashed. Perhaps the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada and its spurious reasons may give pause to reflect upon the words of our National Anthem in praise of "the True North, strong and free." Are we indeed free? Or is the freedom so many purport to enjoy an illusion which may soon be exposed as a hoax? It is the compilers' wish that this book may stimulate a reassessment of what freedoms we actually do have, and will lead some to strive for the restoration of our ancient liberties which sprang from our Faith and Heritage. May we be endued with the spirit which inspired the authors of the Scottish Declaration of Independence to proclaim, "We fight not for glory nor wealth nor honours; but only and alone we fight for freedom, which no good man surrenders but with his life."*

**#097 listed @ sug don \$30.90 - NOW \$22.00**



## CONCLUSION

Most parents will be well aware of these conditions in their own lives as well as the children. If we accept Dr. Robbins' diagnosis it is clear that these conditions are not just something we catch from outside but a response of our bodies to that which has been put into them. It is worth seriously considering how we can change what we allow to enter our bodies—the result may well be significantly improved health not only for ourselves, but particularly for our children. Most children's diseases are not inevitable, but are often caused by poor eating habits.

(adapted from notes compiled by Dr. Joel Robbins, Tulsa OK) Courtesy Light of Life, 200 Florey Drive, Charnwood ACT 2615 www.lem.com.au

## TITHING AND THE KINGDOM

**R. J. Rushdoony**

*“And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel [who we are and claim to be!], saying, He that offereth the sacrifice of his peace offerings unto the LORD shall bring his oblation unto the LORD of the sacrifice of his peace offerings. His own hands shall bring the offerings of the LORD made by fire, the fat with the breast, it shall he bring, that the breast may be waved for a wave offering before the LORD. And the priest shall burn the fat upon the altar: but the breast shall be Aaron's and his sons.’ And the right shoulder shall ye give unto the priest for an heave offering of the sacrifice of your peace offerings. He among the sons of Aaron, that offereth the blood of the peace offerings, and the fat, shall have the right shoulder for his part. For the wave breast and the heave shoulder have I taken of the children of Israel from off the sacrifices of their peace offerings, and have given them unto Aaron the priest and unto his sons by a statute for ever from among the children of Israel. This is the portion of the anointing of Aaron, and of the anointing of his sons, out of the offerings of the LORD made by fire, in the day when he presented them to minister unto the LORD in the priest's office; Which the LORD commanded to be given them of the children of Israel, in the day that he anointed them, by a statute for ever throughout their generations. This is the law of the burnt offering, of the meat offering, and of the sin offering, and of the trespass offering, and of the consecrations, and of the sacrifice of the peace offerings; Which the LORD commanded Moses in mount Sinai, in the day that he commanded the children of Israel to offer their oblations unto the LORD, in the wilderness of Sinai.” (Lev. 7:28-38).*

With these verses, we come to the end of the laws concerning sacrifices and begin a shorter section on the priesthood. We have here references to the wave offering (v.30f., cf. 34) and to the heave offering (v. 32f., cf. 34). S.C. Gayford best describes their meaning:

“The waving was a forward and return motion representing the offering of the breast to God and His handing it back to the priest for his portion. The symbolism is clear from Num. 8:10-22. The Levites were offered by the congregation as a wave offering to the Lord who gave them back to Aaron (v.19) to assist him in his ministrations. There was a difference between the wave breast and the heave thigh: the breast was given to God who handed it back to His priest; the thigh was given directly to the priest. So the priest was the guest of God in the former case and the guest of the sacrificer in the latter,

and thus became the mediator between God and man in the common meal.”<sup>1</sup>

The Hebrew text makes it clear that the breast is a *dedication* (v.30), and the leg is a *contribution* (v.34).<sup>2</sup>

To understand the meaning of the heave offering, the leg or thigh, the contribution to the priests, we must examine Numbers 18:25-28:

*“And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Thus speak unto the Levites, and say unto them, When ye take of the children of Israel the tithes which I have given you from them for your inheritance, then ye shall offer up an heave offering for it for the LORD, even a tenth part of the tithe. And this your heave offering shall be reckoned unto you as though it were the corn of the threshing floor, and as the fullness of the winepress. Thus ye also shall offer an heave offering unto the LORD of all your tithes, which ye receive of the children of Israel; and ye shall give thereof the LORD'S heave offering to Aaron the priest.”*

The rest of the tithe, nine-tenths of it, went to the Levites (Num. 18:29-32). The Levites were the instructors of Israel (Deut. 33:10), and they bore the ark of the covenant (Deut 10:8, 31:9). They assisted in the administration of civil government (1 Chron. 23:28); they were choristers, musicians, guardians, and gatekeepers of the sanctuary (1 Chron. 9:14-33), and overseers (1 Chron. 23:4). Their role in music is cited in Psalm 42:1, 44:1, etc., and 2 Chron. 20:19. They were connected with the temple treasury and with the royal administration (1 Chron. 9:22, 26f.; 23:4, 28, etc). They also served as judges (2 Chron. 19:8, 11) and assisted the priests (1 Chron. 6:31ff., 23:27-32, etc). At the same time, the priests also had duties as officers of health and sanitation (Lev. ch. 11 through 14).

The primary role of the priests, however, pertained to the sanctuary and sacrifices. The Levites had a broader role, one which can be described as educational, legal, and cultural.

With the New Testament, the sacrificial work ended, and the work of the ministry became Levitical. Even our English word *priest* has no relation to the Old Testament word, and *priest* is a contrac-

tion of *presbyter*. The instructional and cultural function is thus Levitical and the essence of the Christian ministry. This duty of instructional and cultural authority and leadership was basic to the medieval and early Reformation eras. Christianity could dominate society for two very practical reasons. *First*, it was seen as the duty of the Christian community and its leadership to exercise dominion over society in the name of Jesus Christ. *Second*, God's tax, the tithe, plus gifts and offerings over the tithe, were the financial mainstay of this dominion mandate.

In the medieval era, a steady rebellion by princes and peoples developed against the tithe, and the church resorted to all kinds of disgraceful devices to raise money. The same happened to the reformation churches, and again there were resorts to painfully bad practices in fund-raising.

The medieval church had built schools, universities, hospitals, cathedrals, charitable organizations, and more, and financed music and the arts. With time, this waned and became something barely maintained rather than a force commanding society. Among the churches of the Reforma-

### **Exposition of a Biblical Teaching: THE BIBLICAL LAW OF THE TITHE and THE MODERN ISRAELITE**

**by Robert Alan Balaicius**

*God promises to prosper His people who honor and serve Him according to His Commands. God is not a whimsical, fickle being. Every Law He established for a purpose—and no law is to be discounted or cast aside as useless or unimportant. God promises health to those who follow His dietary Laws; He promises long life to those who honor and obey their parents. Further, there is a special dispensation of blessing and protection extended to those who offer the first-fruits and tithes of their increase in obedience and honor to Yahweh - Even moreso to those who offer them out of joy.*

**# 337 @ sug don \$7.95**



tion, by the time of Johann Sebastian Bach, the same cultural force was declining. It lingered longer in America, where most universities had a Christian beginning, but here, too, it diminished in time.

Today, while a revival is under way, only a small minority tithe, and many tithees see the tithe as restricted to the church as a worshipping institution. This is hardly the nature of the tithe in Scripture, since nine-tenths of the tithe went to the Levites. When tithing once again finances such things as Christian scholarships, music, law, and the like, we shall see dramatic changes.

Note that the heave offering had to be given *personally* to the priest, even if through a Levite. Christ's work is done by persons; Christian institutions are groups of persons in Christ's service. We should note further that, if a people tithed faithfully, and also gave gifts over their tithe, the priests and Levites would be prosperous and effectual in their ministry. The economic status of those in Christ's service is God's barometer of the faith of a people. Poor faith means poor Levites, a quest by people for personal advantage rather than God's dominion.

An evil inheritance from Neoplatonism is the equation of spirituality with poverty and a contempt for material things. Such an equation begins with a false view of spirituality which is divorced from Scripture and holy ghost. It then sees poverty as a kind of virtue. There is no evidence that either poverty or wealth makes people spiritual and godly, nor is there any evidence that material wealth makes people unspiritual and ungodly. The sin common to all the sons of Adam makes us ungodly, and wealth or poverty have little to do with it. Only the sovereign grace of God can make us a new creation, not wealth or poverty.

Our Lord makes it clear that "the labourer is worthy of his hire" (Luke 10:7). Those who labour worthily in Christ's calling deserve "double honour" (1 Tim. 5:17), i.e., double pay. To His disciples, our Lord says, "Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall we eat? or What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed?" (Matt. 6:31). He did not mean thereby that they would always have their necessary provisions. Rather, He had in mind the law whereby, as Paul summarizes it, God's servants are "partakers with the altar":

*"Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? And they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel."* (1 Cor. 9:13-14).

The health of a society in God's sight is revealed by its support of the work of Christian evangelism and dominion, by the preaching of the Word, by education, scholarship, music, publications, and more. If we limit our view of what constitutes Christ's work, we limit His Kingdom, and our blessings.

note: 1. S.C. Gayford, "Leviticus," in Charles Gore, Henry Leighton Goudge, and Alfred Guillaume, eds., *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture* (New York: Macmillan, 1929), 107.

2. Gordon J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1985), 126.

-----  
**CHRISTIAN POLITICS: TOWARD A  
CHRISTIAN CULTURE**

*by Rod D. Martin -©-2002*

People have strong feelings about the idea of Christian culture. They have even stronger ones about Christian politics. Few of those feelings are good.

This is understandable, not least because the left is good at what we are not, specifically, selling their message. The far left comprises only a tiny percentage of America's population; what's more, they live in a country where large majorities are at least nominally Christian and functionally conservative. Yet the left has successfully sold the idea that the First Amendment which protects the church from the state means Christians are prohibited even from holding political opinions; and so well have the leftists sold this obviously ludicrous position that it is taught from (conservative!) pulpits across America. To hear Tom Brokaw - and some pastors - speak, you'd think religious people are inherently dangerous, and certainly more so than those who lack any moral code whatsoever.

Yet the doubts about Christian culture and politics are also understandable because so many Christians are what their enemies claim: self-righteous, unsmiling jerks. They lack any comprehensive, positive vision of what their nation ought to be; and because they lack that, their activism consists not of building the future but railing against it, or at best of stamping out fires. Drifting from one "moral crisis" to the next, they are always the people complaining (they would call it "standing for truth"), always the ones pointing fingers (they but no one else would see themselves in the role of Old Testament prophets), always the ones saying "Stop!" when others say, "Go."

You'd think these people were orphans. Because if they weren't, their mamas would have told them that you catch more flies with honey; and their

daddies would have told them that you can't beat something with nothing.

It's easy to see why, listening to many of these so-called Christian leaders, even a lot of Christians would fear a "Christian" America. But don't worry: none of these "leaders" will ever produce any such thing. Whether alienating the culture they're supposed to convert, or running from it, or (more often) being absorbed by it without affecting it at all, they are absolutely no threat to the status quo.

Likewise, it's easy to see why the left fears Christians. People who worship political power, who want government to direct (and thus control) all things, who have effectively deified the state, cannot imagine anyone feeling otherwise. Like Tolkien's Sauron, the thought that anyone would choose to destroy the ring of power is beyond them. And because that power is today so pervasive, they not only covet it, but cannot permit it's falling into the hands of men with whom they disagree.

But that is just the point. We do not seek some statist theocracy, substituting our dogma for FDR's Robespierre's or Stalin's. Our King, Jesus, sits today on a throne in Heaven: why would he need one in Washington, or Lon-

***New Tapes/CDs:***

**J-223 The Biblical Doctrine of Hatred**

**J-233 Who's Paying Attention?**

**pastor John Weaver**

**K-558 Deborah, Esther, and Sarah Palin, 1**

**K-559 Deborah, Esther, and Sarah Palin, 2**

**pastor James Bruggeman**

**CD#G-724 You're Eating What? pt 5**

**CD#G-725 You're Eating What? pt 6**

**pastor Ted Weiland**

***free CD but donations appreciated: Contains***

**1. The Voice of the Australian Flag**

**2. The Voice of the Australian Constitution  
(full version).**

**3. The Voice of the Australian Constitution  
(short version).**

**[from PO Box 2231 Mansfield Qld 4122]**



don? And unlike the left -- whose denial of original sin has recently produced such lovely societies as the Soviet Union and Pol Pot's Cambodia -- we're not especially excited about anybody else sitting on that throne either.

It is no accident that Christians -- not others -- abolished slavery, brought liberty to women, and unleashed human creativity through the free market ("thou shalt not steal") and its corollary scientific inquiry such that the world has been repeatedly transformed in just a handful of generations. It is no coincidence that Christians revolted against British statism, that they applied the principles of the Bible to creating a new system of government the like of which none had ever seen, and that the example they set and the hope they inspired has enlightened a world which had previously known almost universal tyranny.

The left must coerce. We need not, and must not. God alone saves sinners; and just as the doctrine of original sin teaches us not to trust governments with too much power, the doctrine of salvation by grace and not works teaches us that coercion is not only ineffective but pointless.

When we speak of a Christian culture, we envision a society suffused with the truth God has shown us in His Word. This sort of culture cannot be built in a day, or even a generation; and yet as more and more see His wisdom, both in principles and results, they will act upon it, and transform everything they touch. But because it is spiritual to begin with, and requires the broad acceptance of ideas which the heart cannot hear without a grace and repentance only God can give. As salt they will preserve what remains, and as light they will dispel the darkness, until their light shines so brightly that all can see, and the nations marvel at the wealth and the wisdom of their land.

Politically, our vision is the same; but we do have shorter-term goals. We seek the end of the idolatry of our age, state-worship. We wish to take back the freedoms on which the statists have encroached, again protecting everyone's life, liberty and property. We intend to restore a Constitutional system which -- like Bible -- requires many checks and balances, as well as the rule of law, so that men are always accountable, and so that power cannot corrupt.

Do we think this can be done in a handful of election cycles? Of course not: the God of sanctification rarely works so quickly even in individuals -- much less in nations -- and even the left took more than a century to bring us here.

But America is a great country, a land of promise and hope, and its very best days are yet to come. We firmly believe that God has raised up our nation to be that shining city on a hill, an example to the world. And if it is less than that today, it is we who must humbly provide the solutions and the vision which will again make it so, bringing morning not only to the New World, but to the Old.

Courtesy International Institute for Christian Culture  
<http://christian-civilization.org/rodmartinpolitics.html>

## BIBLE PREACHING CHURCHES CUT OFF FROM CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL MAINSTREAM

by Robert McCurry

A well-known Christian author and pastor is concerned that a growing number of Evangelical ministers are watering down the Gospel message in order to be "seeker-sensitive."

Pastor John MacArthur says many Evangelical pastors

are presenting what he calls a "reinvented designer pop gospel" in hopes of making Christianity appear more attractive or culturally relevant. MacArthur, pastor of Grace Community Church in Sun Valley, California, says those who preach in that fashion have a weak view of the authority and power of Scripture.

"I think it encompasses a weak view of the honor and power of God and Christ," MacArthur says bluntly. "In other words, I think you're basically usurping the Lordship of Christ over His Church—you're saying, 'I'm going to stand here and give a message that I think is better than the one that Christ gave.'" Such an attitude, he says, is "a frightening thing to think about."

MacArthur believes it is becoming harder than ever to find an Evangelical church that is not compromising the Gospel. He says small churches that remain true to God's Word and do not embrace a user-friendly gospel are often viewed today as "archaic" and "unsuccessful."

"The huge crowds are drawn by lowering all the standards," he says, citing such approaches as a "minimalist gospel," an entertainment mentality, and creation of a social environment that attracts people by promising them "the path to success" and a better economic status.

"You know . . . You'll do better in your job, your career, your family, your marriage, etc.," he says. "Those are the kinds of things that are sold on the 'felt need' counter."

In his recently published book *Hard to Believe*, MacArthur contends that many professing Christians do not understand what it means to be a disciple of Christ because they are seeking an experience rather than a person. He also

takes aim at the so-called "health-and-wealth" and "name-it-and-claim-it" gospel. [Jim Brown, Agape Press]

At the biggest church in the country, Lakewood Church in Houston, Texas, Joel Osteen preaches to some 30,000 people each week—and sin is not on the menu. Osteen said his goal is to "give people a boost for the week." "I think for years there's been a lot of hellfire and damnation. You go to church to figure what you're doing wrong and you leave feeling bad like you're not going to make it," Osteen said. "We believe in focusing on the goodness of God."

"It's not a churchy feel," Osteen said, "We don't have crosses up there. We believe in all that, but I like to take the barriers down that have kept people from coming." Some Lakewood qualities that appeal to a younger set are "the best lighting and the best sound system," a youth program that attracts hundreds, and every service kicks off with 20 minutes of contemporary music—not hymns—played by a live band. [Amy Sims, Fox News]

Speaking of "upbeat contemporary music—not hymns," on April 27, 2009, World Net Daily published a Joke of the Day article entitled, *Music of Churches—'They're sort of like regular songs, only different.'*

An old farmer went to the city one weekend and attended a big city church. He came home and his wife asked him how it was. "Well," said the farmer, "It was good. They did something different, however. They sang praise choruses instead of hymns."

"Praise choruses," said his wife, "What are those?"

"Oh, they're okay, they're sort of like hymns, only different," said the farmer. "Well, what's the difference?" asked his wife.

The farmer said, "Well, it's like this—If I were to say to



you: 'Martha, the cows are in the corn,' well that would be a hymn. If, on the other hand, I were to say to you:

Martha, Martha, Martha, Oh, Martha, MARTHA, MARTHA,

the cows, the big cows, the big cows, the brown cows, the black cows, the white cows, the black and white cows, the COWS, COWS, COWS are in the corn, are in the corn, are in the corn, are in the corn, the CORN, CORN, CORN.

"Then, if I were to repeat the whole thing two or three times, well that would be a praise chorus."

As luck would have it, the exact same Sunday a young, new Christian from the city church attended the small town church. He came home and his wife asked him how it was. "Well," said the young man, "It was good. The did something different, however. They sang hymns instead of regular songs."

"Hymns," said his wife, "What are those?"

"Oh, they're okay. They're sort of like regular songs, only different," said the young man.

"Well, what's the difference?" asked his wife.

The young man said, "Well it's like this—If I were to say to you, 'Martha, the cows are in the corn,' well, that would be a regular song. If, on the other hand, I were to say to you:

Oh Martha, dear Martha, hear thou my cry

Inclineth thine ear to the words of my mouth.

Turn thou thy whole wondrous ear by and by

To this righteous, inimitable, glorious truth:

For the way of the animals who can explain

There in their heads is no shadow of sense,

Hearkenest they in God's sun or His rain

Unless from the mild, tempting corn they are fenced.

Yea those cows in glad bovine, rebellious delight,

Have broken their shackles, their warm pens eschewed.

Then goaded by minions of darkness and night

They all my mild Chilliwack sweet corn have chewed.

So look to that bright shining day by and by,

Where all foul corruptions of earth are reborn.

Where no vicious animal makes by soul cry

And I no longer see those foul cows in the corn.

"Then, if we skip verses two and four, and change key on the last verse, well, that would be a hymn."

Although the above 'joke' is a spoof, it illustrates what is defined as 'praise singing' in many churches today. In the cultural and spiritual chaos of postmodern Christianity, virtually everything is up for grabs. It can be summed up in the simple words of a sign outside a Baptist Church in Valley, Alabama, that announces:

**Contemporary Service**

**11 A.M.**

**Come as you are**

"For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." 1 Cor 1:21.

"Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to them-

selves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables." 2 Tim 4:2-4.

"For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Rom 1:16.

WAKE-UP, PASTORS! WAKE-UP, CHRISTIANS!

Courtesy The Wake-Up Herald, 605 Moore Rd, Newnan GA 30263

## **BUT WHAT ABOUT DEBORAH?**

### **Why the Example of Deborah Does not Support the Candidacy of Sarah Palin**

by William Einwechter, Oct 2, 2008. [emph. added CCL]

[Vision Forum] Editor's Note: [excerpts]

When it comes to the issue of how Christians should vote for a candidate, there is only one question: "By what ethical standard shall we select our civil magistrates? The answer to this question defines the entire debate. And there are only two answers to this question: The first answer is that the Bible alone establishes the complete and authoritative ethical standards for selecting civil magistrates. This is the correct answer for all who claim the name of Jesus Christ as sovereign. It is the only answer that honors the doctrine of the sufficiency of Scripture and the Lord ship of Christ over man, his Church, and the nations.

To ease the conscience of Christians and conservatives, the McCain team (with the advice of key Republican Christians like Dr. Richard Land) turned to Sarah Palin, a female governor who they would attempt to package as a conservative Evangelical to the Right and a feminist innovator to the Left in order to sanctify the candidacy of McCain for conservatives and build bridges with liberal female voters.

[note by Columbia Christians for Life, (CCL): Dr Richard Land, Southern Baptist Convention, is a member of the NWO's Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). In the opinion of CCL, he is not to be trusted by Bible-believing Christians for biblical counsel. In the opinion of CCL Richard Land is a "Judas

goat," leading evangelical Christians astray.

[Council on Foreign Relation (CFR) Membership Roster: [www.stopthenorthamericanunion.com/CFRMembers.html](http://www.stopthenorthamericanunion.com/CFRMembers.html)]

But now there was a problem for partisan leadership within the conservative Christian Church in America. How do Christians support for the second highest elective office in America, a self-avowed feminist, mother of young children who goes back to work three days after giving birth to a Down syndrome baby, who has a child with a teenage pregnancy, who clearly leads the direction of her family, while her husband (whom she formally acknowledges plays a "Mr. Mom" role) follows her and helps to advance her leadership? How do partisan, politically-active Christian leaders do this, given the fact that this is the very type of feminist life-style and vision they have in the past opposed as unbiblical and unwise?

Answer: Appeal to fear; downplay the facts; and whenever biblical concerns are raised, simply mention Deborah.

But now Bill Einwechter answers the question: "But What About Deborah?" Regardless of your political inclinations, you will want to read this important and historic treatise on the doctrine of Deborah and civil magistrates. This may be the most thoroughly-researched and best-reasoned article on the subject in our lifetime.

Readers will learn: (a) about the historical context of

*New Video:*

### **9-11 Mysteries**

#### **part 1. Demolitions - 90 min.**

*official story is unprovable, how firemen talked of isolated pockets of fire which they would be able to control, the building was designed to take multiple impacts of this type, and 140 mph winds and*

**Terror Storm, Alex Jones 180 min.** *The majority of people now believe there was government involvement, and many that it was an 'inside job.' CIA created turmoil in Tehran. The techniques used to overthrow elected governments.*

**DVD#CI-583 @ sug don \$5**



the book of judges; (b) the function of these judges as avengers, military leaders, and deliverers, not as judges as we think of them in a modern context; (c) Deborah's role as a prophetess who judged, but not as a civil authority, or as one of the elected elders or "judges" who defended Israel; (d) why the example of Deborah must be harmonized with the didactic portions of Scripture; (e) why, if Deborah's example is used to justify female civil rulers, it can be used to justify female church rulers; and more.

Why is it critical that fathers and mothers, pastors, and students read this article and come to grips with the structure and nuances of the debate concerning the prophetess Deborah and the present elections? It is critical because conservative Christian leaders have been willing to mortgage their entire future as defenders of the family in America for a political election. And to justify this abduction of responsibility as the representatives of Gospel truth in the nation, they have resorted to theology by maxim: "yes, but what about Deborah?"

[CCL note: Dr. James Dobson of Focus on the Family is one example of a national Christian leader who has chosen the unbiblical path of endorsing the Sarah Palin candidacy. Dobson issued a statement (29 Aug. 08) that included: "Sen. McCain's selection of Alaska's Gov. Sarah Palin is an outstanding choice that should be extremely reassuring to the conservative base of his party." [www.citizenlink.org/content/A000008072.cfm](http://www.citizenlink.org/content/A000008072.cfm)]

Long after the presidential elections of 2008 have passed, Christians will be fighting the battle for the family. But the pro-family Christians of 2008 who set aside their defense of the biblical doctrine of the family and the creation order principle to satisfy partisan political ambitions have lost something fundamental. They have lost the scriptural foundation of their cause. They have sold their birthright for a mess of politically idolatrous pottage. To win an election, they have not only embraced the ideals of feminism, but they have canonized the role models of feminism as saintly examples for the daughters of Zion to emulate.

*"As for my people, children are they who oppressors, and women rule over them, O my people, they which lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths"* (Isaiah 3:12).

-----  
by William Einwechter

The nomination of Sarah Palin to be the vice presidential candidate for the Republican Party has thrilled evangelicals, whether they are egalitarian [1] or semi-complementarian [2] in their views on men and women. Some have been extravagant in their praise of Mrs. Palin's candidacy, while others have been more measured. But there has been a near unanimous agreement that Mrs. Palin is an excellent choice for vice president, and that her place on the Republican ticket enables Christians to confidently support John McCain for president, in spite of his questionable "conservative" record. Some evangelicals have even been sent into what one might call political ecstasy over Sarah Palin.

But some Christians have serious doubts and concerns

about the biblical propriety of Sarah Palin's quest for the vice presidency. Their concerns center around the biblical teaching on the great importance of the roles of a wife and mother in her home and how these roles can, in good conscience, be reconciled with Palin's own circumstances: Five children, one an infant with special needs and one a daughter facing a "crisis pregnancy." The fact that Mrs. Palin, who professes to be a Christian, is a feminist [3] and embodies the anti-Christian feminist vision for womanhood deeply troubles those who desire to rebuild the biblical family and restore the beauty and splendor of Christian womanhood. In addition, there are a number of us who believe that God has ordained the order of male headship for every sphere of government: family, church, and state. Therefore, as we understand Scripture, it is a violation of God's law for a woman to seek the office of civil magistrate (doubly so if she is a wife or mother), or for Christians to support her for office or vote for her.[4]

Evangelicals who have enough biblical sense to feel the weight of these concerns and yet still believe that they should support Mrs. Palin and the McCain/Palin ticket (otherwise Obama might be elected), seek to find some biblical justification for their position.

In this search, all roads lead to Deborah. In Deborah they see the answer to their dilemma. here, they believe, is the example of a godly woman who exercised political leadership in Israel. Her ministry was obviously God-approved, and so the story of Deborah proves that, at least during extraordinary times, God calls women to serve as rulers, kings, and judges, and to lead men and nations. Therefore, from their perspective, the Christian debate about Mrs. Palin is over, and all the concerns of the previous paragraph are no longer valid. In their view, Sarah Palin is a Deborah for our day.

Although one example of Deborah may seem to settle the matter for many, the issues at stake in Mrs. Palin's candidacy have such a potential impact on the cause of biblical family reformation and the truth of biblical authority that the scriptural account of Deborah requires faithful biblical interpretation, and its

application to the question of women magistrates in general, and to Sarah Palin in particular, requires careful thinking. This essay seeks to accomplish these things and answer the questions: Does the example of Deborah establish the biblical propriety of female civil magistrates? Does it provide Christians with a biblical justification for their support of Mrs. Palin?

### **DOES THE EXAMPLE OF DEBORAH ESTABLISH THE BIBLICAL PROPRIETY OF FEMALE CIVIL RULERS AND SARAH PALIN'S CANDIDACY?**

There are a number of issues that we need to explore in regard to this question. We have to determine the historical context of the book of Judges. We have to decide what the office of "judge" entailed. We need to determine what Deborah's role was and whether or not we are justified in saying that she filled the role of a "judge" and/or the office of a civil magistrate. We need to understand how historical examples relate to the direct instruction of the Law of God.

### ***DVD's You May Have Missed:***

The Prophecy Club Presents:

### **GENERAL BENTON PARTON**

*Applying his knowledge of explosives to the bombing of the Oklahoma City government building. Could a fertilizer bomb bring down a steel-framed building?*

**DVD#CI-527 @ sug don \$10**

-----  
and

### **UNDER SIEGE**

*They're coming for you!- from the director of Beyond Treason and 9-11 in Plane Sight. A William Lewis film, One Nation Under Surveillance. Prepare to be instantly propelled into a world dominated by spying, tracking and control as you go behind enemy lines drawn in our own backyards. Hear what the experts have to say about the emergence and defeat of our Big Brother society.*

from Sunrise.

**DVD#CI-529 @ sug don \$ 20**



We need to consider the ramifications of the view that Deborah's example establishes the rightness of female magistrates and how that view affects our understanding of the role of women in the church.

### The Historical Context of the Book of Judges.

1. The book of Judges records the history of Israel from the death of Joshua until the birth of Samuel (Judg. 1:1, 21:25; 1 Sam. 1:1-28).<sup>5</sup> This is one of the darker periods of Israel's history. It was marked by lengthy seasons of apostasy, sin, and lawlessness (Judg. 17:6; 21:25). It contains a uniform cycle that goes from sin in Israel, to *oppression* by other nations, to repentance by the people and prayer for God's mercy, to deliverance from foreign oppression by the power of God through specially chosen leaders that were called "judges."

What is important to note, for the purposes of this essay, is the recurring phrase in Judges that "*in those days there was no king in Israel*" (Judg 17:6; 18:1; 19:1; 21:25). This indicates that there was neither a central government nor a chief magistrate to give unity and direction to the whole nation.<sup>6</sup> In the days of the judges, Israel was a loose confederation of tribes that were governed by "elders." These elders consisted of the rulers of the individual tribes and the local elders in the towns and villages, the government of the people in terms of civil law and justice rested in their hands (Judg. 2:7; 8:16; 11:5; 21:16; Ruth 4:2; cf. Num. 32:28; Deut 5:23; 16:18; 19:12; 21:2-6, 19-20; 25:5-8). The men who were the appointed civil leaders in Israel at that time of Judges were also called the "governors of Israel," i.e. those who make or decide law, rulers, civil leaders, commanders (Judg. 5:9, 14, cf Deut 33:21; Psa 60:7), and "princes," i.e. those who have dominion in the civil sphere, rulers, chiefs, captains (Judg. 5:15; 10:18; cf Deut 1:15).

In defining the role of the judges in the book of Judges, and in determining Deborah's place and function in the historical setting of Israel's government in the time of the judges, these historical facts must be kept in mind. If we set aside the structure of Israel's civil government in that day, we are in danger of drawing faulty conclusions concerning the nature of the judges and the nature of Deborah's service to Israel.

The Function of the "Judges" in the Book of Judges.

2. It is significant to note that the "judges" in the book are *not* identified with the elders of Israel. This means that the judges were not part of the normal structured government of Israel, and so, whatever the exact nature of their public leadership was, and it may have varied, they were not civil magistrates, they did not govern in the civil sphere. Evidence of this fact is seen in the story of Gideon, one of the most illustrious of the judges. After his great victory over the Midianites, he was offered the position of chief ruler of Israel, but he categorically turned down the offer.

"Then the men of Israel said unto Gideon, 'Rule thou over us, both thou and thy son, and thy son's son also for thou hast delivered us from the hand of Midian.' And Gideon said unto them, 'I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you: the LORD shall rule over you.'" (Judg. 8:22-23).

Further evidence is provided by the example of Samson, one of the most well-known of the judges. There is no indication whatsoever from the Bible that he ever held any civil office or carried out any of the duties related to the office of civil judge or ruler, yet the text says, "he judged Israel twenty years" (Judg 16:31). In fact, none of the men who served as judges are ever pictured in the text of the book of Judges in the role of a civil magistrate (i.e. of ruling as elders, princes, or governors). Or, as Richard Schultz expresses this fact, "There is no clear textual evidence that these individuals ever exercised any judicial authority.

What, then, was the role of the judges? In answering this question, we should begin by defining the word "judge." The Hebrew word has three basic senses: 1) to act as a lawgiver, to rule, to govern; 2) to decide controversies, to establish justice and equity, 3) to execute judgment, to punish the guilty, or to defend the cause of the oppressed.<sup>8</sup> The particular sense in which this word is used in any given text must be determined by the context. According to its usage in connection with the judges of the book of Judges, the word should be understood in the third sense. The judges were men who were used of God to defend the cause of an oppressed Israel by executing judgment on the enemies of Israel. Hence, when the text says that they "judged Israel" it does not mean that they governed Israel as civil rulers, but that they carried out God's judgment on Israel's oppressors and defended the people from further oppression.<sup>9</sup>

We ought to make this deduction concerning the meaning of the word "judged" because of the way the term is used in Judges in relation to the judges. The biblical text indicates that the judges functioned as national deliverers, i.e. they were men who were

raised up by God to fight against the enemies of Israel in view of breaking the yoke of Israel's foreign oppression (Judg. 2:14-19; 3:9-10, 15; 1 Sam 12:8-11). The author of the book of Judges explains the role played during this period as follows:

"...the hand of the LORD was against [Israel] for evil, as the LORD had said, and as the LORD had sworn unto them: and they were greatly distressed. Nevertheless the LORD raised up judges which delivered them out of the hand of those that spoiled them" (Judg 2:15-16).

In fulfilling this role, they are pictured as men of war leading the armies of Israel, i.e. they were military commanders. This role is clearly portrayed in the cases of Othniel, Ehud, Gideon, and Jephthah. Othniel is the first judge of this period, and the description of his service as a judge is instructive and representative of the others:

"And when the children of Israel cried unto the LORD, the LORD raised up a deliverer to the children of Israel, who delivered them, even Othniel the son of Kenaz, Caleb's younger brother. And the spirit of the LORD came upon him, and he judged Israel, and went out to war: and the LORD delivered Chushanrishathaim king of Mesopotamia into his hand, and his hand [prevailed against Chushanrishathaim]" (Judg 3:9-10).

The role of Tola, Jair, Ibsan, Elon, and Abdon is obscure in the biblical text, but based on the example of the other judges, we can assume that they fulfilled a similar military role in Israel. Shamgar and Samson were also

### New Videos:

From America's Promise Ministries 2008  
Summer Conference

### COVENANT BLOOD AND CIRCUMCISION

in two parts, by Bible Teacher,  
James W. Bruggeman  
DVD#CI-608 @ sug don \$15

and

### LAW OF TWO WITNESSES

in two parts, by Bible Teacher Rob Corry  
DVD#CI-609 @ sug don \$15



judges, and although they did not lead any armies, they were men of war who defeated the enemies of Israel single-handedly. This leaves us with Deborah and Barak. What were their roles? Which one was the judge, or were they both judges? We will consider these questions in the next section.

### The Role of Deborah in the Book of Judges

3. If we are going to understand the role of Deborah in the book of Judges, we must carefully consider what the text actually says about her. We must not read our own ideas into the text, superimposing our own system of government on the text as a grid to understand Deborah, nor assume that because the text says she “judged Israel” that it means she judged in the same way as Othniel, Ehud, Shamgar, Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson. She must be understood in her own historical and biblical context. How does the biblical text describe Deborah and her role in Israel? It says:

*“And Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, she judged Israel at that time. And she dwelt under the palm tree of Deborah between Ramah and Bethel in mount Ephraim and the children of Israel came up to her for judgment”* (Judg 4:4-5).

This text reveals three things about Deborah. *First*, she was a “prophetess.” This is the feminine form of the Hebrew word for “prophet.” The biblical role of a prophet was to speak the Word of God to Israel in terms of God’s will (law) for Israel, and His plan for the future (prophecy, cf Deut 18:15-22). Up until the time of the judges, the term prophet had been applied to only two men, Abraham (Gen 20:7), and Aaron (Ex 7:1). Moses is compared to a prophet but it is placed in a class by himself (Num 12:6-8); Deut 18:15, 34:10). The word “prophetess” had only been applied to one woman: Miriam (Ex 15:20). In other words, the prophetic role had not been exercised since the days of Moses. This makes the statement that Deborah was a prophetess all the more remarkable.

What did she do as a prophetess? If her role was similar to a prophet, then she spoke the Word of God and prophesied of the future. The story of Deborah indicates she did both: She gave the Word of God to Barak, and she prophesied that Israel would win the upcoming battle with Sisera (Judg 4:5-7). She may also have carried out a ministry similar to the only other prophet mentioned in the book of Judges (Judg 6:8-10), who rebuked the people for their sin and called them to repentance. But Deborah does not appear to have exercised her prophetic role in the towns and villages of Israel or by going out and preaching to the people. Instead, the text reveals that she ministered at her own dwelling and gave the Word of the Lord to those who came to her.

*Second*, she was “the wife of Lapidoth.” This is actually an obscure phrase, and its meaning is disputed. Some believe that it reveals the name of her husband. Others believe it gives the place where she is from, i.e., she is “a woman of Lapidoth.” Others think that it refers to the fact that she made wicks for the lamps of the Sanctuary. Because of the ambiguity of this phrase, it is uncertain whether or not she was a married woman. Most likely, the text is identifying the place of her origin.

In Judges 5:7, Deborah refers to herself as “a mother in

Israel.” There is debate over what this actually means. It could indicate that she was married (or she may have been a widow at the time of Judges 4-5) and was a mother of children. But it could also be figurative, indicating that Deborah saw herself as one who had a maternal concern for Israel. Regardless, the phrase does point to Deborah’s consciousness that her role was consistent with the female gender. What she did for the house of Israel was consistent with what a godly mother would do for her own household in times of distress. It also suggests that Deborah did not presume to take headship in Israel or usurp authority over the men.

*Third*, the text says that she “judged in Israel at that time.” It is important to understand that the function of Judges 4:5 is to explain how she judged Israel: The people of Israel came up to the place where she dwelt seeking “judgment” from her. What, then, does it mean that she “judged” Israel? There are a number of things to consider in answering this question. Note, first of all, that her judgment was tied to her gift of prophecy. Her judgment was a charismatic function related to her prophetic role. There is no indication in the text that her judging was based on a position (an office) she held in the civil government of Israel; she is never identified as an “elder,” “governor,” or princess. Next, consider the fact that the place of her judgment was under a palm tree and not in the gates of the city, the place where the elders (the civil rulers and civil judges) normally governed (Deut 16:18; Ruth 4:1-2; Rom 31:23). Finally, note that her judging was not related to defending the cause of Israel against foreign oppressors by fighting against them, but it appears to have involved settling disputes and questions of law for the children of Israel. If we take the words of the Scripture as our guide, we see that the judging ministry of Deborah was not that of an appointed civil magistrate or a military leader, but of a divinely inspired woman giving God’s Word to those in Israel who sought her out.

Therefore, the Hebrew word for “judged,” as it is used in reference to Deborah, means to establish righteousness and equity. It describes the action of deciding controversies and discriminating between persons and between right and wrong in civil, religious, domestic, and social disputes or questions (the second sense of the word “judged” as defined above). The word “judged” is applied customarily to the action of a civil ruler, but it is not an action that only official rulers can carry out.

We must remember that the particular meaning of a word has to be determined by its immediate context. In the context of Judges 4, the word “judged” does not mean to rule as a civil magistrate (the first sense of the word “judged” as defined above), or to execute judgment (the third sense of the word “judged” as defined above), but it is applied to a prophetess giving divine guidance to Israel and settling disputes of those who came to her. Matthew Henry gives an insightful explanation of Deborah’s ministry in Israel:

“She judged not as a princess, by any civil authority conferred upon her, but as a prophetess, and as God’s mouth to them, correcting abuses and redressing grievances, especially those which were related to the worship of God. The children of Israel came up to her from all parts for judgment, not so much for the deciding of

### *Pamphlet - Handout* The Jewish Question **LISTEN MR. PREACHER**

by John L. Steely

*“Pastor, I challenge you to prepare and preach a sermon on two verses of the Bible: Acts 26:6-7.”*

*What is this? Some kind of nut? You’ve preached dozens of sermons from Acts.- “And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made by God to our fathers, unto which promise our twelve tribes, earnestly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope’s sake, King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews.”*

**#912 listed at \$2.50 for 10,  
now 10 for \$1.50**



controversies between man and man as for advice in the reformation of what was amiss in things pertaining to God. Those among them who before had secretly lamented the impieties and idolatries of their neighbours but know not where to apply for the restraining of them, now made their complaint to Deborah, who, by the sword of the spirit, showing them the judgment of God, reduced and reclaimed many . . . .<sup>10</sup>

Since Deborah is specifically identified as a prophetess (and not as a civil ruler), and since her judgment is tied to her prophetic gift, Henry's view admirably fits the context. As a prophetess, Deborah did not bear the sword to enforce her decisions or counsel as an elder or civil magistrate would have done. While her word was to be heeded, she did not dispense justice through civil sanctions or punishment. Furthermore, there are no biblical examples of prophets enforcing their counsel through civil punishment either. Rather, the prophet was the mouth-piece of God communicating the consequences of disobedience with the promise that God would vindicate His Word through judgment by providential or miraculous means. It is the civil magistrate's decisions and judgments that are enforced by civil sanctions. But, the prophet brought a message from God with enforcement coming from God Himself. In Judges 4:4-5, we do not see a civil ruler issuing or enforcing orders, but a godly woman giving divine counsel, answering questions, and settling disputes for those who voluntarily sought it.

In view of the context, in view of Israel's civil government in the days of Deborah, and in view of the description of her ministry, it is best to conclude that Deborah was not a civil magistrate and held no formal position of civil leadership in Israel. She had an important ministry, and at times she may have rendered judgment on questions of civil law, but she was a prophetess, not an "elder" or a "governor." *There is no evidence that Deborah ever sought or held the office of a civil ruler.* With this conclusion the Reformer John Knox is in full agreement:

"Such as have more pleasure in light than in darkness, may clearly perceive, that Deborah did usurp no such power nor authority, as our queens do this day claim. But that she was endued with the spirit of wisdom, of knowledge, and of the true fear of God: and by the same she judged the facts of the rest of the people. She rebuked their defection and idolatry, yea and also did redress to her power, the injuries that were done by man to man. But all this, I say, she did by the spiritual sword, that is, by the Word of God, and not by any temporal regiment [government] or authority, which she did usurp over Israel." [11]

**DEBORAH Was Not a "Judge" in the Sense that the Book of Judges Defines that Role....**

4. *... that specific role belonged to Barak.* We are also justified in concluding, from Judges 4:4-5 and from the rest of the account of Deborah and Barak, and from the description of the actions of Othniel, Ehud, Shamgar, Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson that Deborah was not one of the judges of the book of Judges. [12] This conclusion is based on the following considerations.

First, she did not fulfill the role of warrior or lead Israel into battle. When it was time for Israel to rise up and throw off the yoke of Jabin, king of Canaan, and judge the enemies of God's people, the Lord did not call or appoint Deborah to fight Jabin or command the armies of Israel. Instead, God used her, as His prophetess, to call and appoint Barak to that position (Judg. 4:6-7; 5:12). And although Deborah accompanied the army at Barak's request, she did not lead the army into the battle or direct the fight once it began; the text leaves no doubt that Barak was the military commander [13] It was the faith, courage,

and leadership of Barak during the battle itself that brought deliverance to Israel (Judg 4:10-17; cf. Heb 11:32) and judgment on Jabin. As a warrior and the actual military commander that led Israel to victory, Barak should be considered the "judge" in keeping with how the term is employed during this era (Judg 2:16; 3:10).

Second, the author of Hebrews points to Barak, not Deborah, as the "judge" (agent of deliverance) of their time. When the writer of Hebrews is recounting the victories of faith wrought through the judges of the book of Judges, he does not mention Deborah at all; instead, in a list of other judges who helped to rescue Israel from pagan oppressors, he names Barak. He says: "And what more shall I say? for the time would fail me to tell of Gideon, and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthae...." (Heb. 11:32). Thus, the New Testament connects Barak with the other judges and affirms that he was one of the deliverers of Israel who brought God's vengeance on the heathen and freedom to the oppressed. ----- *to be continued.*

God willing, the remainder of this article will be included next month.

### EYE CONTACT WITH BIG BROTHER

Many people have wondered about the switch-over from analog to digital and the "upgrade" is one that will facilitate high-tech mind control. Our U.S. Military has used such technology for over ten years, and it was used on the Iraqis to bring them to their knees quickly when invaded in 1990. The technology is called Silent Sound Spread Spectrum or SSSS. U.S. Patent number 4,858,612 was issued to Philip Stocklin on December 19, 1983, for the invention. It is also known as sound of silence (remember the Simon & Garfunkel song), and it works by transmission of sound undetected by the ear but planted into the human auditory cortex of the brain. It is the ultimate in universal mind control. If this system were attempted to be used with the old analog television, it would show up only as static. That is why everything must be converted to digital, and the government will help you pay for it. Don't put it past Big Brother to try to put the will of the Antichrist directly into your brain as you make eye contact with your digital television. You may find yourself thinking things you otherwise never think and doing things you would otherwise never do! Incidentally, the first verse of the satanically prophetic song the "Sound of Silence" reads as follows: "Hello darkness my old friend. I've come to talk with you again, because a vision softly creeping, left its seeds while I was sleeping, and the vision that was planted in my brain still remains, within the sound of silence."

(From: Last Trumpet Newsletter, PO Box 806 Beaver Dam, WI 53916.

Courtesy Straws in the Wind.)

I hope and pray this Messenger finds you all in health, and that you are finding it very beneficial reading. Thank you for the favourable comments we have received in recent months regarding the contents on the articles in the Messenger. We always have mountains of material to wade through and select those articles as the spirit leads. I do hope you receive this somewhere near 'on time' as the last one was so late. Now, the 'mail room staff' is going away for some weeks which may cause some delays in getting your requests dealt with after you receive this messenger. We do appreciate all your letters and clippings, and will try to get your material to you as soon as possible. Thank you for your ongoing support without which we could not continue.

May our heavenly Father watch over you and bless you and keep you in His gracious care,

