



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 - 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!*

#295

Covenant Messenger

November AD2010

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

"IDENTIFYING ISRAEL - PART VI" "The Missing Years of Jesus Christ" by Jim Jester

Does it not seem odd that very little is known about most of Jesus' life (the central figure in the New Testament)? The Bible tells us a little about His first twelve years, a lot about His last three-and-a-half years, but nothing about an eighteen year span between ages twelve and thirty. This is the rest of the story.

The Early Years of Jesus

Luke 2:46-52, "And it came to pass, that after three days they found him in the temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions. And all that heard him were astonished at his understanding and answers. And when they saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? Behold, thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing.

And he said unto them, how is it that ye sought me; wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business? And they understood not the saying which he spake unto them. And he went down with them, and came to Nazareth, and was subject unto them: but his mother kept all these sayings in her heart. and Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man."

The Bible does not tell us much about the early years of Jesus Christ, but there are enough hints given by the Gospel writers to make us ask a few questions, and come to some probable conclusions. First of all, it is evident from Luke that Holy Spirit was working in the life of the 12-year-old Son of God by the fact that He was in the temple speaking with the teachers and answering their questions.

Secondly, Jesus' responses such as, "Do you not know I must be in my Father's House?" and "I must be about my Father's business", certainly show us that carpentry was not on his mind. Nowhere does the Bible tell us that Jesus was a carpenter, only that He was a carpenter's son.

Thirdly, Luke tells us that Jesus "was subject" to his parents, as any well-mannered child would be, for he went with them. This account helps explain what became of the "missing eighteen years" (age 12-30) of Jesus' life from the Biblical account. Perhaps this was the turning point where He was about to leave His childhood home.

Luke (1:2) tells us that the Gospel narratives of Jesus' life were eyewitness accounts, so the writers had not seen Jesus' adult life until about age thirty. This is significant and implies that Jesus was not even in Palestine! If such a youth who amazed the teachers with his wisdom and was worshipped by the Parthian nobility (the Magi) at His birth had been living in the area, surely everyone would have

known Him. And did the spiritual power manifesting itself at the temple lie dormant for all this time. Would the Son of God "quench the Spirit" and live as an obscure carpenter for eighteen years? Not likely!

Matthew (13:54-56) shows us that after this eighteen year period, Jesus was scarcely remembered in His own home town. This very child amazed everyone at the time in the temple, as they asked, "Where did this man get his wisdom?" If this Man of such wisdom had been present in Nazareth for those eighteen years, they would not be asking such a ludicrous question.

The crowd is struggling to remember by quizzing themselves, "Is this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary; and his brethren, James, and Joseph, and Simon and Judas? And his sisters are they not all with us?" The fact that they could name off all the immediate family members indicates that Jesus had not been "with them." If Jesus had been a hard-working carpenter in Nazareth all His life they would have easily recognized Him.

It appears evident that sometime in this eighteen year period of Jesus' life His father, Joseph, had died. There is no mention of him since the time that they found Jesus in the temple, and when Jesus' home town crowd named off His close relatives, Joseph was not among them. It appears that during this time, Joseph of Arimathea became His guardian, for it was he who later claimed the body of Jesus by going straight to governor Pilate.

Just as the crowd had a hard time identifying Jesus, so today most people have difficulty identifying the Israelites.

IN THIS ISSUE:

Identifying Israel, Pt 6,	1
What Is fear?	4
Global Warming,	5
The Necessity of Creationism,	7
The Promise of Jonadab,	11
Generational Message,	13
Sex Russian Roulette Can Backfire,	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.

Most are conditioned and propagandized to believe that the ancient tribes of Israel were lost to history, but we who know the basic Biblical principle of “kind after kind” have no problems identifying Israel today.

There is a popular bumper sticker that says, “My boss is a Jewish carpenter.” This is very deceptive, for Jesus was not a “Jew” nor a “carpenter.” The only way for the statement that Jesus and His whole family were “Jewish” to make any sense would be that “Jewish” means “of the racial descent of Judah”. Those called Jews today are not descended from the tribe of Judah, they are a mixed race from Esau, and they practice a perverted religion of Babylon.

Jesus was not “Jewish” in any religious sense at all by today’s meaning. Certainly He supported God’s Law, but not the Talmud (the traditions of the elders) for He was always in trouble with the Pharisees. Jesus was not a Jew, He was an Israelite; and this is the term He used in John 1:47, “Behold an Israelite indeed, in who is no guile!” Paul also used this term in Romans 11:1.

The words “Jew” and “Jewish” should be dropped from our vocabulary, unless the meaning is made abundantly clear to the hearer. It is true that the term “Jew” is used often in the New Testament, but it is misleading because it means something different today than it did then. [I made a brief study of this in part 2 of this series]. It is the manipulation of words and their meanings that cause us to misidentify Israel today.

TRAVELS OF JOSEPH AND JESUS

The Gospels were eyewitness accounts of Jesus in Judea. To find any other information on Jesus we must turn to other sources. In “*The Traditions of Glastonbury*” (p.22), E. Raymond Capt gives evidence that Joseph of Arimathea was an international merchant working for the Roman Empire. (DVD #CI-159 @ \$25, Book #345 @ \$17.85).

This would certainly explain why he had such direct access to Pilate concerning the body of Jesus. Certainly the Romans must already have known him to allow such quick access at such a critical time. For Pilate to immediately order the body of Jesus delivered also indicates that Joseph was a close relative. Roman law required that the bodies of criminals were disposed of in common pits with all memory of them removed, unless the body was promptly claimed by a relative.

So if Jesus was not in Palestine for eighteen years, then where was He? Legends and traditions are our only source of reference, but they are buttressed by the Bible’s implication that Jesus was missing for a prolonged period of time. If Jesus was under Joseph’s tutelage at this time, He likely did lots of travelling, since Joseph’s job would have required it. It is also likely that Jesus was a business partner as well. He would have been welcome anywhere in the Parthian Empire as well as the Roman Empire. Not only would Joseph and Jesus have access to all the trading routes, but Jesus was even eligible to be king in Parthia. The Parthian royalty had visited Him and given lavish gifts at His birth because Jesus was an Arsacid - a relative of the Parthian kings descended from Phares and David.

Many traditions assert that Joseph and Jesus had homes in the area of Glastonbury, England. Capt cites a fifteenth century document that Joseph of Arimathea converted King Arviragus of first century AD Britain to the Christian religion, and that the king gave Joseph and his party twelve portions of tax-free land in the area of Glastonbury. This land is confirmed in the “Doomsday Book” of early English history under the title “Domus Dei” (Ibid, pp.39-41)

Another fact given by Capt is that the Druids wor-

shipped a trinity of gods “known as ‘Beli,’ the Creator as regards the past; ‘Taran,’ the controlling providence of the present, and ‘Yesu,’ the coming savior of the future.” The name “Beli” preserves a Hebrew word for “Lord,” and in its expectation of a coming “Yesu” savior. “*Druidism thus anticipated Christianity and pointed to the coming savior under the very name by which the Christ was called.*” (Ibid, p.9). The presence of Hebrew words in Druidism indicates that it had some roots in the religion of the ancient Israelites in Britain throughout the first millennium BC.

Other ancient legends say that Jesus went as far east as India and Nepal; which happens to be the eastern edge of Parthia (Ibid, p.7). There is a Biblical basis for all of this, for Jesus said in Matthew 15:24, “*I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel.*” As we have seen in this series of articles, the ten tribes of Israel had been scattered over a large area of the globe. Many ancient Israelites were identified as Britons, the Carthaginians, the Sacae/Saka/Scythians and the Parthians in Asia. Jesus may have even gone as far west as North America since there was a Punic colony there until about 500 AD. Since Jesus said He was “sent” to those ten tribes, then it is logical He actually did go to where the various tribes were located in the first century AD.

In “*Voyages to the New World*” (p. 125-126), Nigel Davies includes a collection of Quetzalcoatl legends. These legends include the assertion that Quetzalcoatl “had white skin and was traditionally expected to return ...but only in human form: amid the lamentations of his people, Quetzalcoatl thereafter set out on his long journey to the place in the East where he was destined to meet his end.” that “he rose to heaven and entered therein,” and that “he remained four days in the land of the dead and, on the eighth day, reappeared as the Morning Star.”

Davies also comments that Quetzalcoatl is depicted as a “god in human form” and that he was the “creator god” (Ibid, p.131). Quetzalcoatl is usually depicted as a serpent god. It is significant that the humanized Quetzalcoatl legends appear only during the Christian era, where he is depicted as a benevolent figure travelling from place to place, “preaching repentance and performing miracles” (Ibid, p.136; emphasis added). Charles Boland’s book, “*They All Discovered America*” (p.303), adds that “the first Quetzalcoatl is said to have sprung from a virgin birth.”

Christian inscriptions were found in the Mayan ruins dating from the first to the third century AD, indicating that Christianity existed in the New World soon after the life of Jesus Christ. At one time Christianity was well-founded, but had degenerated into practices of sun-worship by the native populations found by the Spaniards. Is it not the same today with pagan sun customs blended into contemporary Christianity? Sure it is.

Consider the following from “*The Cross of the Inca,*” Stender, Epigraphic Society Occasional Publications, Vol. 17, 1988, p.179:

“*Many of the Catholic rituals taught to the Maya were already familiar to them, to the great surprise of the early missionaries. The Maya practiced baptism in water, confirmation, fasting... The cross was a familiar icon ... When the friars explained that the cross was the sign of God, who had died on the Tree of Good and Evil and now lives in the heavens, the Maya accepted it as another version of a story they already knew.*”

The cross was a well-known symbol in the New World, especially among the ruling class. Walter Stender also wrote (Ibid, pp.179-183):

“*When the Spaniards conquered Peru, they were aston-*

CI Fellowship Wanted:
If you live in the Toowoomba or Brisbane areas please email Eric at:
boetaboer@gmail.com
Thank You!



ished and puzzled to find crosses in the temples and palaces of the royal Inca family... For the Incas, the use of the cross was a continuance from preceding cultures... it becomes evident that the cross had a religious significance. Legends exist from various sites in South America that white men came to the natives to teach them a better way of social life... all these white men... were bearded, and another feature is particularly remarkable: the garments of these white visitors have been decorated with white and black crosses... At the time of the Spanish conquest there was a broad awareness in South America of an early presence of white residents..."

Matthew 8:24 gives us a clue that Jesus was used to travelling: "And, behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, inasmuch that the ship was covered with the waves: but he was asleep." We must remember that Jesus was flesh and blood like us, and should have had "sea sickness" like the rest of them. But here He was, just fine and asleep. He must have been used to ocean travel where storms were even worse than on this smaller body of water.

THE LATER YEARS OF JESUS

Luke 4:16: "And he came to Nazareth where he had been brought up: and as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up for to read." [Is it your custom or habit to go to church on the Lord's Day?]. Notice that Luke did not say Nazareth was "where He lived." Jesus had returned from His "missionary" journeys to the Israelites scattered abroad in Asia, Europe and the New World. Now He goes to the synagogue of His boyhood home town and begins to read from Isaiah 61, but stops after the two opening verses. The reason He stopped short was because He was not there to fulfill the messianic prophecies of the coming kingdom of heaven, but was about to bring a spiritual deliverance from the sins of Israel, thus establishing the New Covenant with them.

It appears that many in Judea were expecting a deliverance from Rome; they referred to Him as the "son of David". Didn't Jesus say "I come to bring a sword, not peace."? The disciples even quarreled about who would be the greatest in the kingdom that Jesus would rule. But no, this was to be a spiritual deliverance, not a physical one. Collins, in the book, "**The Lost Ten Tribes of Israel Found**" (p.302), gives us this picture:

"It is possible that some Jewish leaders of the day, not realizing that Christ's first coming was to bring salvation instead of physical salvation from Rome, felt they had to "assist" or "push" Jesus into confronting Rome in order to fulfill all the Messianic prophecies at that time. After all, did not Ezekiel 37:15-28 prophesy that the House of Israel and House of Judah would be united under "David" their King? Since Jesus was a direct descendant of David, and was a relative of the Parthian kings, and had already been worshipped by some of the Parthian nobility that picked Parthian kings, the Jews could easily assume that Jesus was poised to fulfill this prophecy by uniting Parthia (the House of Israel) and the Jews (the House of Judah) [this is error, as only a small percentage of Judeans were actually of Judah, most were of Esau-Edom, CIM] in a war against Rome! Those expecting (and wanting) such a war must have been very frustrated and disgusted at what they perceived to be a "cozy" relationship between Jesus and the Romans.

"Rome was a despotic empire which tightly controlled its subjects. Yet the entire life of Jesus exhibited a lack of Roman control over his activities. He could travel where He wanted, when He wanted, and with whom He wanted, without the supervision or permission of Roman authorities. This freedom was permitted by the Romans in spite of the fact that Jesus was drawing huge crowds and talking about a new "kingdom," a message that Rome could

easily have seen as encouraging a Jewish [Israelite] revolt. Why did the Romans allow freedoms to Jesus that they regularly denied to others?"

Probably the main reason was Roman-Parthian relations. At this time period there was peace between the two world super-powers. Caesar had decreed that this relationship was not to be disturbed. The Roman rulers of Judea risked Caesar's wrath if they provoked a war with the Parthians that Caesar didn't want. Couple this with the fact that Jesus was a relative of Parthia's emperor (an Arsacid) because of the widespread knowledge that He was of the seed of David. Not only did the Magi from Parthia pay Him homage at His birth, but there is also evidence that they maintained a good relationship. There is even record of a correspondence between Jesus and one of the vassal kings of Parthia.

The Greek historian, Eusebius, in "**The History of the Church**" (I, 13), tells us that King Abgar of Edessa was dying from some kind of incurable disease and he wrote a letter begging Jesus to come and help him. He also offered Jesus refuge:

"I understand the Jews are treating you with contempt and desire to injure you; my city is very small, but highly esteemed, adequate for both of us." (Ibid I,13).

This is an amazing record that Eusebius has preserved for us, that Jesus was given an official offer of sanctuary in Parthian territory from the dangers in Jerusalem. He also gives us the letter, attributed to Jesus, in response:

"Happy are you who believed in me without having seen me! For it is written of me that those who have seen me will not believe in me, and those who have not seen me will believe and live. As to your request that I should come to you, I must complete all that I was sent to do here, and on completing it must at once be taken up to the One who sent me. When I have been taken up I will send you one of my disciples to cure your disorder and bring life to you and those with you." (Ibid I, 13).

This document would have been about 300 years old when Eusebius read it in the Royal Records of Edessa. It is completely compatible with what

we know about Jesus from the eyewitness gospel accounts. It also expresses the imminence of His crucifixion. We know of Jesus' reluctance to heal non-Israelites (Matthew 15:21-28), yet we see complete willingness to heal King Abgar, and more. If Jesus had travelled to Parthia during His missing eighteen years, he would have known them to be of the ten tribes of Israel.

According to Eusebius, the archives of Edessa recorded that after Jesus' death and resurrection, Thaddeus was sent by the Apostle Thomas to Edessa. He healed King Abgar and many of his subjects. The king also ordered his subjects to assemble and hear the preaching of Thaddeus and offered him silver and gold, which he refused. King Abgar is quoted as saying:

"I believed in Him (Jesus) so strongly that I wanted to take an army and destroy the Jews who crucified Him, if I had not been prevented by the imperial power of Rome from doing so." (Ibid I, 13).

Remarkable! Here is a record of a Parthian vassal king wishing to mount a military campaign to punish those responsible for crucifying Jesus the Christ. This account confirms that Jesus had strong supporters in the Parthian Empire, justifying Rome's reluctance to interfere with His life.

A second reason for the good relationship between Jesus and the Romans is that they knew Him well. If He had participated in the business transactions of Joseph He

New Videos:

CI-799 JFK CONSPIRACY -
YouTube JFK; by James Earl Jones.
A re-evaluation of the Zapruder film
and eyewitnesses. @ \$5
CI-800 IRAN IS NOT THE
PROBLEM. *Historical record of*
corporate US imperialism, with
scholarly research. We don't agree
with their solutions. The problem?
Lawless government. @ \$5



would have travelled all over the Roman Empire and come in contact with Roman officials many times. It is likely, since Joseph was a Roman citizen (as was Paul), that Jesus may have obtained Roman citizenship. Many in the Jewish community avoided the Romans as “unclean gentiles,” yet Jesus was not reluctant to heal a Roman centurion’s servant (Matthew 8).

A third reason that Jesus was able to travel as He pleased, was that He was wealthy. The Parthian Magi had given “gold, frankincense, and myrrh.” We are not told how much, but it was probably substantial since Jesus was royalty, and an angel had directed them there. Matthew 2:9 says, “...the star, which they saw in the east, went before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was.” It is more likely that this “star” was actually an angel (messenger) of God directing them. A celestial body would not be able to stand directly over a city, or a house. This angel must have had a glory (or glow) that appeared as a star. From other scriptures we can see that the word “star” is sometimes used to represent an angel. (See Job 38:7, Revelation 1:20).

Also, the context of Matthew 2:2 indicates that no one else saw this “star.” In verse 7, Herod is asking the Magi when “the star” appeared, indicating that no one in Judea was aware of any such phenomenon. If there had been some unusual celestial body then Herod and his astrologers would already have known the exact date that it appeared. After the angel had led the Parthians to Judea, the angel vanished, forcing them to ask Herod for directions. After they left Herod, the angel appeared again to lead them to the house of the child. This reminds me of the earlier time when a pillar of fire led a group of Israelites out of Egypt.

We should also consider that Jesus would have had access to wealth from Joseph. He and His band of disciples never asked for donations, yet they regularly gave to the poor (John 12:5). Judas felt that there was enough in the bag that it would not be noticed if He took some (John 12:6). With this in mind, Paul’s comment (2 Corinthians 8:9) takes on more meaning; “For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus the Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor; that we through his poverty might be rich.”

A fourth reason that Rome allowed Jesus to speak, is that part of His message actually served Roman interests. When the Pharisees wanted to entangle Jesus on the issue of Roman taxes (Matthew 22:15-22), He chose a non-confrontational response. When the Jewish leaders urged Pilate to crucify Jesus, some of them may have seen it as a final attempt to make Jesus use His divine powers against Rome to save Himself. Perhaps this is what Judas thought as well. The action he took after Jesus allowed Himself to be crucified was such an unexpected shock that he killed himself (Matthew 27:3-5).

The tendency is to blame Rome for killing Jesus the Christ, but Pilate took many opportunities to avoid killing a just man. Pilate could have wondered whether the Jews were plotting with the Parthians to provoke an incident (killing Arsacid) which could bring about a Parthian-Jewish war against Rome, so he had to avoid that possibility at all costs; after all it was Passover and many Parthian/Israelites were present in Jerusalem for this (national) holiday.

Pilate wanted any type of sign from Jesus defending

Himself. Jesus knowing why He was there, kept silent. The implication was that if Jesus made any effort at all to defend himself, Pilate would have set Him free. Pilate even offered a trade off to try and keep Jesus alive, but the “deck was stacked” by the Sanhedrin with their own followers in the crowd. His wife even warned him. Running out of options Pilate told the crowd and leaders in Luke 23:4, “I find no fault in this man.”

Next he began a public defense in Matthew 27:23, “Why, what evil has he done?” He even tries a delaying tactic by sending Him to Herod (Luke 23:5-11). Rome could execute whoever they wanted and cared nothing about any “due process.” But here we have a Roman governor doing all he could to save Jesus’ life. Finally he was out of options. A riot was about to start, which could easily turn into a revolution at that time. Washing his hands he proclaimed himself “innocent of the blood of this just person” (Matthew 27:24). In so doing, Pilate was disassociating

Rome from the murder of a popular celebrity of the Parthians. He wanted it publicly obvious that the responsibility for this crucifixion lay with the Jewish hierarchy, not with Rome.

CONCLUSION

“And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen.” (John 21:25).

Keep in mind that the eyewitness accounts of the Gospel writers were only what took place in Judea and Galilee during the last three and a half years of Jesus’ life. What took place in the other parts of the world, as implied in this

verse, was ministry to the “House of Israel” during the missing eighteen years of His life. No wonder that information could fill so many books. Now we know why Jesus said in John 10:16,

“And other sheep (Israel) I have, which are not of this fold (in Palestine): them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice: and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd.”

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

WHAT IS FEAR?

by Bob Vermaat

“Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom.” (Luke 12:32).

According to Webster’s New World Dictionary fear is:

1. A feeling of anxiety and agitation caused by the presence or nearness of danger, evil, pain, etc. and timidity; dread; terror; fright; apprehension.

2. Respectful dread; awe; reverence.

3. A feeling of uneasiness; disquiet; anxiety; concern.

In other words, “fear” means

1. To be afraid of; dread.

2. To feel reverence or awe for.

3. To export with misgiving.

If we look at today’s economic situation that prevails in most of our western nations, it is easy to understand why people are concerned for their immediate future. Job security is scarce, finances are dwindling in a lot of cases, retirement funds are being compromised, and in some cases homes are being lost because of these situations. Yes, peo-

Old Historic Videos:
Masonic Sorcery; A Biblical Economic Choice; Law and Psalm 37;
3 messages by late Howard Freeman
DVD#CI-111 @ sug don \$15

Temple Care; Your Body - Our Future
by Timothy Kersten
Why Was I Created?
by Brad Bulla
DVD#CI-112 @ sug don \$15

(remember Old Historic Videos are not today’s DVD quality having been copied from old NTSC videotapes, no-one else now has these available apart from CIM!



ple fear for their well-being, so I think that this fear or anxiety is fear number 3, as per Webster's. In Luke 12:6,7 we read as follows: "Are not five sparrows sold for two farthings, and not one of them is forgotten before God? But even the very hairs of your head are numbered. Fear not, therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows." Let's also look at verses 27 through 31 of the same chapter.

"Consider the lilies how they grow. They toil not, they spin not; and yet I say unto you that Solomon, in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these. If then God so clothe the grass, which is today in the field, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, how much more will he clothe you, O ye of little faith. And seek not what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, neither be ye of doubtful mind. For all these things do the nations of the world seek after; and your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. But seek ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you."

So, in essence Jesus is telling us in these verses to get our priorities straight. "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." (verse 34). But this fear is not a fear unto death, but a concern about an uncertainty, an apprehension about future things, that even though we know that the Lord will provide all things, we in our finite mind cannot see and be certain of things in the immediate future. Hence the fear and/or dread of the unknown! But life goes on, and we keep plugging along, in the hope that sooner or later things will turn out for the better.

The second definition of fear according to Webster is "awe, reverence"; such as fear of God. This does not mean we are to be afraid of God, but to revere Him, to pay Him honour. In other words we are to be in awe of God simply because He is the only true God. The creator of Heaven and Earth and all that is therein, including us. The best definition of fear of the Lord in my estimation is found in the books of Psalms and Proverbs, and in a lot of instances it shows that fearing the Lord has profound benefits. So let us look at a few passages of scripture to that effect.

"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge, but fools despise wisdom and instruction." (Proverbs 1:7).

"The fear of the Lord is to hate evil; pride and arrogance, and the evil way, and the perverse mouth." (Proverbs 8:13).

"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge of the Holy One is understanding." (Proverbs 9:10).

"The fear of the Lord is a fountain of Life, to depart from the snares of death." (Proverbs 14:27).

Thus according to Solomon, through the fear of the Lord we gain wisdom, knowledge and long life, and we learn to hate evil and arrogance! Let's also see what David had to say in the Psalms,

"The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever; the ordinances of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold; sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb." (Psalms 19:9-10).

"Let all the earth fear the Lord; let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of him." (Psalms 33:8).

"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. A good understanding have all they that do his commandments; his praise endureth forever." (Psalms 111:10).

I could go on and on but these few verses will suffice to show that to fear the Lord is a good thing, a very good thing and way of life.

Thus, this brings me to the first definition of fear according to Webster's Dictionary, which is a fear unto death, evil, terror, danger. This fear I want to pay particular attention to, because this fear will often lead unto sin, namely the sin of denial and omission. In today's politically correct society we in general remain silent, even though a lot of today's principles are in direct contrast to the Biblical principles we profess to hold dear. We are afraid to be called out for standing on Biblical truths and ideas.

In today's humanistic and secular society for example, even our Christian holidays are so secularized that all aspects of religion have almost disappeared. Christmas carols are not allowed in public, the nativity scene is not allowed to be shown in public places, yet the Muslim Holy Days such as Ramadan and the like are honoured by all, even our own politicians. The same goes for the Jewish holidays such as Hanukah, in which the Menorah is displayed for all to see, and no one makes any objection to this display, not even the Christian community. This is a sin of denial; we won't take a stand for the Holy Name of Jesus.

"But he that denieth Me before men shall be denied before the angels of God." (Luke 12:9).

When someone makes light of Mohammed half the world is in an uproar, yet when Jesus is depicted as a hippy and a whore-monger in some of Hollywood's movies, it is called entertainment (protected by "free speech"). When His image is spit upon and urinated upon it is called art. And again most of Christianity is silent, and pretend that it didn't happen.

"Whosoever, therefore, shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed when he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels." (Mark 8:38).

Whether it is in the spoken word or whether it is the written word, why are we so afraid to

stand up for what the Bible teaches us? If we would just trust and stand on God's Word, the Holy Spirit will guide and lead and protect us from all evil that lurks in the world. Jesus told us in Matthew 10:34, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth, I came not to send peace, but a sword." And in Ephesians 6:17 Paul said, "And take the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God." And also Hebrews 4:12, "For the Word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword ...and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart."

So, you see brothers and sisters, we do have the tools and the wherewithal to stand firm in our beliefs and to fight and correct those things which were wrongly brought upon us. It is our Christian duty. We cannot and must not fail the commandment of our Lord to occupy till He comes. And once we start to occupy again we will be able to take charge of all things wrong and perverse and make this world a place fit for God's Kingdom on Earth.

Courtesy Thy Kingdom Come, PO Box 1478, Ferndale WA 98248

GLOBAL WARMING?

WHAT A LOAD OF POPPYCOCK!

by Professor David Bellamy

Daily Mail, 2004

Whatever the experts say about the howling gales, thunder and lightning we've had over the past two days, of one thing we can be certain: someone, somewhere - and there is every chance it will be a politician or an environ-



mentalist - will blame the weather on global warming.

But they will be 100 per cent wrong. Global warming - at least the modern nightmare version - is a myth. I am sure of it and so are a growing number of scientists. But what is really worrying is that the world's politicians and policy makers are not. Instead, they have an unshakeable belief in what has, unfortunately, become one of the central credos of the environmental movement. Humans burn fossil fuels, which release increased levels of carbon dioxide - the principal so-called greenhouse gas - into the atmosphere, causing the atmosphere to heat up. They say this is global warming: I say this is poppycock. Unfortunately, for the time being, it is their view that prevails.

As a result of their ignorance, the world's economy may be about to divert billions, nay trillions of pounds, dollars and roubles into solving a problem that actually doesn't exist. The waste of economic resources is incalculable and tragic.

DREADED

To explain why I believe that global warming is largely a natural phenomenon that has been with us for 13,000 years and probably isn't causing us any harm anyway, we need to take heed of some basic facts of botanical science.

For a start, carbon dioxide is not the dreaded killer greenhouse gas that the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro and the subsequent Kyoto Protocol five years later cracked it up to be. It is, in fact, the most important air fertiliser in the world, and without it there would be no green plants at all.

That is because, as any schoolchild will tell you, plants take in carbon dioxide and water and, with the help of a little sunshine, convert them into complex carbon compounds (that we either eat, build with, or just admire) and oxygen (which just happens to keep the rest of the planet alive). Increase the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, double it even, and this would produce a rise in plant activity. Call me a biased old plant lover but that doesn't sound like much of a killer gas to me. Hooray for global warming is what I say, and so do a lot of my fellow scientists.

Let me quote from a petition produced by the Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine, which has been signed by over 18,000 scientists who are totally opposed to the Kyoto Protocol. The Kyoto Protocol committed the world's leading industrial nations to cut their production of 'greenhouse gasses' from fossil fuels. They say: "Predictions of harmful climatic effects due to future increases in minor greenhouse gasses like carbon dioxide are in error and do not conform to experimental knowledge."

(Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine are the producers of a self-teaching 'Home School Curriculum' with a course of study, tests, plus a 500 book library, the Encyclopedia Britannica 11th Edition [old version, 1910-1911], KJV Bible, Koran, and Webster's Dictionary - all for about \$200 available on-line: look for **OISM** on *Google*).

You couldn't get much plainer than that. And yet we still have public figures such as Sir David King, scientific advisor to Her Majesty's Government, making preposterous statements such as "by the end of this century, the only continent we will be able to live on is Antarctica."

At the same time, he's joined the bandwagon that blames just about everything on global warming, regardless of the scientific evidence. For example, take note of the

alarm about rising sea levels around the south coast of England and subsequent flooding along the region's rivers. According to Sir David, global warming is largely to blame.

But it isn't at all. It's down to bad management of water catchments, building on flood plains and the incontestable fact that the south of England is gradually sinking below the waves. And that sinking has nothing to do with rising sea levels caused by ice-caps melting. Instead, it is purely related to an entirely natural warping of the Earth's crust, which could only be reversed by sticking one of the enormously heavy ice-caps from past ice ages back on top of Scotland.

Ah, ice ages... those absolutely massive changes in global climate that environmentalists don't like to talk about, because they provide such strong evidence that climate change is an entirely natural phenomenon. It was around the end of the last ice-age, some 13,000 years ago, that a global warming process did undoubtedly begin. And not because of all those Stone Age folk roasting mammoth meat on fossil fuel camp fires, but because of something called the 'Milankovitch Cycles,' an entirely natural fact of planetary life that depends on the tilt of the Earth's axis and its orbit around the sun.

MELTED

The glaciers melted, the ice cap retreated and Stone Age man could begin hunting again. But a couple of millennia later, it got very cold again and everyone headed south. Then it warmed up so much that water from melted ice filled the English Channel and we became an island.

The truth is that the climate has been yo-yo-ing up and down ever since. Where it was warm enough for the Romans to produce good wine in York, on the other hand, King Canute had to dig up peat to warm his people. Then it started warming up again. Up and down, up and down. That is what temperature and climate have always done in the past and there is no evidence that they are not still doing exactly the same thing now. In other words, climate change is an entirely natural phenomenon, nothing to do with the burning of fossil fuels.

In fact, a recent scientific paper, rather un-entirely titled: "*Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide Concentrations Over The Last Glacial Termination*," proved it. It showed that increases in temperature are responsible for increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide levels, not the other way around.

IGNORED

But this sort of evidence is ignored; either by those who believe that the Kyoto Protocol is environmental gospel, or by those who know that twenty-five years of hard work went into securing the agreement and simply can't admit that the science it is based on is wrong.

The real truth is that the main greenhouse gas - the one that has the most direct effect on land temperature - is water vapour; ninety-nine per cent of which is entirely natural. If all of the water vapour was removed from the atmosphere, the temperature would fall by 33 degrees Celsius. On the other hand, remove all of the carbon dioxide and the temperature might fall by just a third of a percent. But we wouldn't be around anymore, because without carbon dioxide there would be no green plants, no herbivorous farm animals, and no food for us to eat.

New CD's

G-433 Preparing for the Next Millennium, pt 6

G-434 Things They Didn't Tell Me, pt 1,

Pastor Ted Weiland

E-312 The Third Commandment, 2 Tim. 1:3-9

E-313 Why Israel? 2 Kings 18:9-16

Pastor Don Elmore

E-316 Bad Ideas are Not Fair, Numbers 3:38

Pastor Mark Downey

K-584 & K-585 The Seal of the New Covenant:

I in You, Ye in Me. pts 1 & 2

Pastor James Bruggeman



It has been estimated that the cost of cutting fossil fuel emissions in line with the Kyoto Protocol would be £76 trillion (AUS \$128.8 trillion). Little wonder then, that world leaders are worried. So should we all! If we signed up to these scaremongers, we would be wasting a gargantuan amount of money on a problem that doesn't exist - money that could be used in umpteen better ways: fighting world hunger, providing clean water, developing alternative energy sources, improving our environment.

CREATING JOBS

The link between the burning of fossil fuels and global warming is a myth. It is time that world's leaders, their scientific advisors and many environmental pressure groups woke up to the fact!. (By email).

THE NECESSITY OF CREATIONISM

by Rousas J. Rushdoony (1967)

(reprinted from *The Mythology of Science* [Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 2001], 61-67).

When the first edition of Charles Darwin's "*On the Origin of the Species*" was published on November 24, 1859, all 1,250 copies sold out on the day of publication. The world was waiting for a theory with scientific prestige to render the Bible and God obsolete, and men immediately jumped on the bandwagon of Darwinism. George Bernard Shaw described the relief of men at being rid of God and declared "the world jumped at Darwin."¹

A great many churchmen climbed on that bandwagon then, and many more have done it since. The appeal is very great. Why not compromise? Why not be "scientific," or scientifically respectable? When the Genesis account of creation is such a liability, why not concentrate on other matters of the faith and accommodate the Bible to evolution? Why risk being considered ignorant and backward?

Bernard Ramm, in "*The Christian View of Science and Scripture*", searches for "more credible, reasonable interpretations which should cause no embarrassment to any man with a scientific mentality but also with Christian convictions."² Ramm's purpose is to harmonize the Bible and modern science. Is such an approach tenable? Why defend old-fashioned, strict creationism?

St James observes, "*For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.*" (James 2:10). Similarly, anyone who denies the authority of Scripture at one point has denied it at all points. If we assert that we can set aside the six-day creation doctrine, we have asserted our supremacy over Scripture. Our mind and our convenience now have a higher authority than the Bible, so that we have denied its authority totally and asserted our authority instead. If we claim the right at any point to set aside Scripture, we have established ourselves as the higher authority at every point. Clearly, therefore, the question of authority is at stake in Genesis 1: God or man? Whose word is authoritative and final?

But there is much more at stake. Science itself is involved. There are issues involved in creationism which

are basic to the existence of science. Let us examine the necessity of creationism for science. Dr. Robert P. Knight, MD in his presidential address to the American Psychopathological Association (New York, May 9, 1946), states:

"Determinism is a fundamental tenet of all science. Indeed, it is inconceivable that we could explain or count on anything in the physical world without relying on the basic assumption that all phenomena are strictly determined. Dynamic psychology is a science of human thinking and human behaviour, and as a science must be deterministic. The phenomena of human thought, feeling, and behaviour, of the whole range of pathology, must be understandable and explainable in terms of the causal factors of heredity, early psychological conditioning, subsequent life experiences, the composite of forces, external and internal, playing on the personality. In such a deterministic science of human behaviour there is no place for the fortuitous, nor for "free will" in the sense used in philosophy. Whatever human actions or decisions seem to indicate the operation of a free will, or a freedom of choice, can be shown, on closer inspection and analysis, to be based on unconscious determinism. The causal factors were there and operative, but were simply not in the conscious awareness of the individual."³

Knight's conclusion is a very interesting one:

"Determinism is a prerequisite of all science, including dynamic psychology. The alternative is not free will, but indeterminism, which implies chaos, unpredictability, and a denial of cause and effect relationships in human affairs. Free will is a subjective feeling, which is better called a sense of inner freedom, and which depends on harmony and integration of the personality. It is experienced by those psychologically healthy persons who willingly choose a course of action according to inner standards they are glad to obey. Psychotherapy, far from requiring freedom to choose in order to influence patients treated, itself operates deterministically to achieve for the patient this subjective sense of freedom."⁴

Without getting involved in a discussion of predestination versus determinism, we can observe that Knight has rightly seen that the issue is one between a world under absolute law and a world of chaos, and he sees a world of law and of cause and effect as basic to science. If chaos or chance be ultimate, then there can be no science.

An absolute, determined order, Knight states, "is a fundamental tenet of all science... a prerequisite of all science."

But this statement points to a schizophrenic aspect of modern science. The theory of evolution requires a belief that somehow all things arose out of chance, and out of "the fortuitous", which Knight condemns; evolutionary science denies spontaneous generation as a fact but requires it in theory to account for the universe. Thus, J.H. Rush, while unable to affirm spontaneous generation, places his hope on finding evidence of it and writes:

"It would be satisfying to find some kind of life on another planet, even lowly forms, to support our basic thesis that life is a spontaneously originating process."⁵

Science thus *wants* a universe of law and of causality without God, but it would rather ascribe all the magnificent order of the universe to chaos rather than to God, because the scientists involved are fallen men, in rebellion against

New LOAN ONLY DVD's

FIVE HUNDRED YEARS OF LIBERTY BIRTHED BY THE REFORMATION

by Doug Phillips

Hold on to your seats for this "big picture" message as Doug puts the global influence of John Calvin in perspective and provides a panoramic overview of the Reformation in the context of 2000 years of Church history. The most significant worldview issues articulated by Calvin.

#CI-699 LOAN ONLY sug don \$5

THE MAN OF THE MILLENNIUM

by Dr. Joseph Morecraft

Historians as diverse as Bancroft, van Ranke, and d'Aubigne have acknowledged John Calvin's influence on Western liberty. But John Calvin deserves the title (above), not only because he is the most influential man of the past 1000 years, but because he remains one of the most important for the 21st century.

#CI-700 LOAN ONLY sug don \$5



God and bent on suppressing their knowledge of Him.

Men will either presuppose God, or they will presuppose themselves as the basic reality of being. If they assume themselves to be autonomous and independent from God, they will then wage war against God at every point. There is no such thing as an area of neutrality: men will either affirm God at every point in their lives and thinking, or else they will deny Him at every point.

As Dr. Cornelius Van Till observes:

"Now if our contention (that the evolution-hypothesis is a part of an atheistic theory of reality) is correct, then we must do away with every easy-going attitude. The evolutionist is then a soldier in that great, that seemingly all-powerful army of antitheists that has from time immemorial sought to destroy the people of God. We must then prepare for a life and death struggle, if not in the courts of the land, then in the higher courts of human thought.

Every time any human being opens his mouth to say anything, he either says that God is or that God is not a reality. It could not be otherwise. God claims to control every fact."⁶

Since God created all things, nothing can be truly understood apart from Him, and no fact can be truly interpreted apart from Him. When men seek to give an atheistic or agnostic interpretation to any fact, it is because they are at war with God and are bent on denying Him.

The basis of evolutionary theories is this anti-God position of apostate and fallen man. The convincing thing about evolution is not that it proves man's origins, or even gives anything resembling a possible theory, but that it dispenses with God. Scientists themselves have often called attention to the absurdities of evolutionary theory. Consider, for example, the comments of G.A. Kerkut, a biochemist:

"It is... a matter of faith on the part of the biologist that biogenesis did occur and he can choose whatever method of biogenesis happens to suit him personally; the evidence for what did happen is not available."⁷

It seems at times as if many of our modern writers on evolution have had their views by some sort of revelation...."⁸

This does not mean that Kerkut accepts creationism. Any alternative is preferable, apparently, to evolutionists other than God. His hope is that "future experimental work" will provide an answer,⁹ but he is already sure that the answer will in some form be evolution. Thus, his basic assumption is a religious faith that the answer is not God but something else, although he does not know what that something is! Evolution is not a science but a religious faith which has taken over the sciences and rules them dogmatically.

And yet evolution, which rests on chaos, is held by men whose sciences presuppose God and His eternal decree. Evolution requires chance, whereas science rests on absolutely determined factors and causality. The doctrine of evolution is thus basically hostile to science.

Again, evolution is a theory which is radically hostile to Biblical religion. The Bible clearly asserts that God created heaven and earth, the whole created universe, in six days. If this statement be allegorized or interpreted away,

no meaning stands in Scripture. Because God created all things, He and He alone is the sustainer, governor, and redeemer of all things. Man is responsible to God because God is his maker, because man is totally God's creation and therefore totally under God's Law. God is man's saviour because God as creator is alone omnipotent over man and the universe and sufficient for all things. God is man's judge because He is man's creator, and He created man for His own purpose and glory.

If God's creative work is denied, then God's governance and redemption are also denied, because God is made irrelevant to man and to the universe, or at least no longer omnipotent over them. Every doctrine of Scripture is undermined when strict creationism is undermined. Wherever strict creationism is set aside, the vital nerve of Christianity is cut, and the church begins to move in terms of humanistic and political power rather than the power of God.

The alternative to creationism is evolution, and Darwin had led to Marx and Freud, to materialism and agnosticism, and, as M. Stanton Evans has noted, to the "annihilation of value derived from Nietzsche and James and Dewey. These are the root precepts of Liberal philosophy."¹⁰

The problem of our time is not material: it is spiritual. Technology has given man more material wealth than he has ever before possessed, but man's condition is regularly described as a desperate one, and man lives in a chronic state of anxiety. What the doctrine of evolution has done is to destroy man, not God. A theory cannot alter ultimate reality; it can affect the mind and welfare of man. How has it done so?

First of all, man is no longer viewed as created in the image of God. According to Scripture, man was created in God's image, and, although fallen, is strictly under God's Law. Man cannot be reduced to the level of an animal. The Sabbath was made for man,

not man for the Sabbath. The state is made for man, not man for the state. Man is called to glorify God and to enjoy Him forever, and the world is man's dominion under God.

But the evolutionary theory views man as a product of the world rather than a destined lord over it in Christ. Man is seen as having evolved out of the fortuitous concourse of atoms and out of the primeval slime. Instead of being set over nature, man is set under nature as a product of it. Man is reduced to the same slavish status as existed during antiquity in Egypt and other states which held to an evolutionary concept.

Man's liberty is a product of Biblical faith; the concept of evolution produces slavery, and it was welcomed by Marx as the necessary foundation for socialism. When man, as in evolutionary thinking, is a product of nature, he is passive in relationship to nature; his being is determined by nature, and his psychology is passive, conditioned, a reflex action rather than a governing action.

When man knows himself to be created by God, and this faith is basic to his thinking, man is a product of God's creative work and is therefore passive in relationship to God but active towards nature. He is then determined by God, not by nature, and man is then active towards nature

Must Have Book for Identity
THE CASE OF SAUL OR PAUL
by **Brandon P. Hawkins**

There is today much controversy with the Israel-Identity movement concerning this man "Saul" or "Paul." Conflicting reports are coming to us from scholarly sources expounding both pro- and anti-Paul points of view. Were Paul's writings inspired or conspired? This is the point of study and only the acid test of Scripture will reveal the justice of God, for His words are perfect and do not contradict themselves. Do Paul's words, then, conflict with themselves or with the writings of any others in the Bible, including those words spoken by our Master, Jesus, the Anointed? Before examining the evidence we must be impartial, gathering our conclusions from the inspired text of God - that is, from the Hebrew and Greek texts in which God caused our Bible to be written, and not from man-made translations of these texts.

#975 @ sug don \$5.95



and governs it.

Man is then free from nature, not a slave of it, because man is created and governed by God, not by nature. Man's calling is to exercise dominion under God over nature, to rule it, develop and exploit it, under God and to His glory. Only the regenerate man in Jesus Christ can do this. The fallen man is in captivity to his own nature and to the forces around him. As a result, liberty rapidly declines when Biblical Christianity declines. Where men are not ruled by God, they are ruled by tyrants. And the rise of evolutionary thinking has produced a worldwide rise of totalitarianism. Since man is no longer seen as a creation by God, he is becoming a creature of the total state, and the total state is determined to remake man in its own image.

As a result, man is now the primary experimental animal. Many people are alarmed at the use of animals in scientific experimentation. But the grim reality is that the primary experimental animal is man. Not only the mental health experts, but virtually every agency of civil government is today engaged in trying to remake man. Moreover, scientists are engaged in experiments concerning psychochemical and electronic controls over man.

Such experiments were reported in *Life* magazine, March 8 and 15, 1963.¹¹ Scientists seriously talk, as did C.R. Schafer, at the National Electronics Conference at the Illinois Institute of Technology, about enslaving men with built-in electronic controls, a socket mounted under the scalp "a few months after birth," with "electrodes reaching selected areas of brain tissue." After "a year or two... a miniature radio receiver and antenna would be plugged into the socket," and from that time on the child would be modified "or completely controlled by bio-electric signals radiated from state-controlled transmitters."¹²

When they begin by talking and experimenting in this vein, as they have done, we can be sure that the conclusion of their thinking will be far worse. [of course, with today's technology, this can be achieved with the implantable micro-chip, as is already done with all livestock and pets, CIM]

Orwell's 1984 will look like a paradise compared to what these evolutionists plan to do with man. When men set aside God as Creator, they then set themselves up as man's recreators, as the new gods over man and the universe. It was this same temper which characterized man before the Flood, and Genesis 6:5 declares,

"And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually."

A second way in which evolutionary theory has altered the mind of man is with respect to responsibility. According to Scripture, man is a responsible creature; his responsibility is to serve and glorify God; failing to do this, man became a sinner, sentenced to death. Evolutionary theory, because it sees man as a product of nature, sees man, not as a responsible creature made in the likeness of God, but as a product of a long evolutionary history and his environment. As a result, man is not responsible; he is not a sinner but a victim. He is what his environment has made him. The means therefore of changing man is not regeneration, not moral responsibility and renewal, but changing his environment. Man has to be reconditioned. This means a Pavlovian world.

Even as Pavlov trained his dogs to salivate when he rang a bell, so man has to be trained, like any animal, by

conditioning. This means that education ceases to be education: it becomes brainwashing and conditioning. This means also that responsibility disappears. After all, it is not the criminal's fault, it is society's fault; it is not the young delinquent's fault, it is his family's fault. Mothers as a result are extensively blamed for their children's sins and failures, for their mental collapse. As one psychiatrist, Humphrey Osmond, MD, notes:

"And if Mama was not to blame, the myth goes on, it must be Papa, or the husband or wife. This can be extended, and is extended, to anything in the family background - poverty, riches, lack of discipline, too much discipline.

"Thus far, however, no one has blamed sons and daughters for the schizophrenia of Mama and Papa. But parents may have senile psychosis, and the day may come when children will be blamed for that. It is dangerous these days to be the relative of a person who is mentally ill for you will probably be blamed for driving him mad."¹³

This trend to blame someone or something else will not be stopped by such common sense observations by a few dissenting psychiatrists. Environmentalism is a logical necessity for evolutionary thinking. The theory holds that man is a product of his geological and biological environment and, because evolution is a continuing process, not a finished act, this means that man is still a product of his environment. As a result, the logical evolutionist will, first, insist that the environment is responsible for man, not man for his environment. Second, he will try to provide the right biological and social environment to further man's evolution and to prevent man's devolution.

This means total control over man, supposedly for man's welfare. Again we face the inescapable fact that evolutionary thinking requires totalitarianism. If the education of a people is dedicated to teaching evolution, it will also teach socialism or communism. Karl Marx knew better than others that evolution was a necessity for communism's success: it made socialism "scientific." *If men put their faith in evolution, they will then look to scientific socialist planners for salvation rather than to Jesus Christ.* Their maker is

their saviour. Friedrich Engels agreed with Marx that Darwin's theory was basic to scientific socialism.¹⁴

When man is regarded as a product of his environment rather than a creature responsible to God, he ceases to be of much importance, either as a person or in his thinking. Darwin himself doubted the validity of his own ideas in many directions. For example, while denying all revelation, he believed that it seemed reasonable to conclude "that the Universe is not the result of chance," even though his theory did so much to enthrone chance. Then he added:

"But then, with me, the horrid doubt always arises whether the convictions of man's mind, which has been developed from the mind of lower animals, are of any value or at all trustworthy. Would any one trust in the convictions of a monkey's mind, if there are any convictions in such a mind?"¹⁵

Darwin thus professed little respect for his own thinking. It is not surprising then that he had little respect for some races. He believed that some would be eliminated, and wrote,

"Looking to the world at no very distant date, what an endless number of the lower races will have been eliminated by the higher civilized races throughout the world."¹⁶

In other words, Darwin felt that evolution would elimi-

New Book

DANIEL'S SEVENTY WEEKS **How It Shapes Modern Eschatology** **by Dr. Stephen E. Jones**

The 70th week of Daniel is misunderstood in most prophecy teaching today. This has led to a multitude of incorrect assumptions about the events surrounding the second coming of Jesus. This is a study of history as well as end-time events.

#644 @ sug don \$7.50



nate "lower races." This is one possible approach to the problem from the evolutionary perspective: weed them out. The other approach is equally deadly: since environment changes men, provide these "lower races" with a new environment, new education, and a new set of controls, and you will evolve them quickly to the same level as what Darwin termed "the higher civilized races." Both of these evolutionary approaches reveal a fundamental contempt for man and a readiness to use him experimentally. More important, they shift the problem from faith and character to planning and control, from responsibility to conditioning and experimentation.

A third way in which evolutionary thinking has affected the minds of men is that it has given men a new religion, and that new religion is science. A C.F. Weizsacker observed at a scientific gathering:

"Science today is the only thing in which men as a whole believe: it is the only universal religion of our time... The scientist has thus got himself into an ambiguous position: he is a priest of this new religion, possessing its secrets and marvels; for what to others is puzzling, strange or secret is plain to him. It is suddenly clear in many countries that the future of a nation, of a continent, of a view of life depends on producing enough scientists. Is this immoderate faith in the power of science justified?"¹⁷

One of the clearest bits of evidence that science is now man's universal religion is the history of the churches since Darwin. Modernism is simply an attempt to keep religion up to date with science and philosophy. Even within supposedly evangelical circles, we see men like Ramm seeking a harmony with science. Genesis is interpreted, not in terms of what the text requires, but in terms of evolutionary geology by most commentators. When even the churches move so extensively in terms of the authority of the evolutionary scientist, how much more so does the world bow down before this new priesthood?

A fourth way in which evolutionary thinking has affected the minds of men is in the area of morality. Biblical morality declares the sovereign authority of God and establishes His clear-cut commandments for men. Morality thus has reality; it is grounded in ultimate reality; it rests on the truth of God's Word and has the authority of God's judgment behind it. The theory of evolution has no moral absolutes. Morality like man is a product of evolution; it represents, not ultimate and absolute truth, but social mores and customs.

The new morality is the logical result of evolutionary theory. It simply wipes out all moral standards. The champions of the new morality declare that anything done "by mutual consent should not be prohibited by law" and is morally legitimate. The only crime is said to be compulsion or force used against another person [except as practiced by the state against the individual, CIM].

According to the "*Bruins for Voluntary Parenthood and Sexual Liberty*," in a 1966 handout at UCLA, "Where there is no victim, every act is morally right," and virtually every form of perversion is then listed and defended. but why limit the lawful acts to voluntary acts? After all, if, as such persons believe, there is no ultimate truth, no ultimate right and wrong, why not regard force as equally good as consent? The Marquis de Sade was more logical here: for him, the only real crime was Christianity; all else was permissible, every sexual crime, theft, and murder also.

"Can we possibly imagine Nature giving us the possibility of committing a crime which would offend her?"¹⁸

At least one killer of late has been motivated in part by the Marquis de Sade's writings. A murderer in England, who boasted of several brutal murders, was a professed follower of the degenerate Marquis.¹⁹ It is ridiculous to believe that, when men believe that every kind of act is morally legitimate and natural, they will not begin to practice many of these acts.

And this is exactly what is happening all around us. The growing incidence of every kind of perversion and crime is a witness to this moral collapse. Sigmund Freud knew that the total breakdown of all law and order could easily follow the widespread adoption of unbelief.

When the masses become as atheistic as their leaders, Freud feared that they,

"...will certainly kill without hesitation... And so follows the necessity for either the most rigorous suppression of these dangerous masses and the most careful exclusion of all opportunities for mental awakening, or a fundamental revision of the relation between culture and religion."²⁰

In other words, Freud saw the solution, as he proceeded to develop it, as one of total control in the scientific socialistic state. Either that, or atheism would lead to mass murder and total lawlessness.

Unfortunately, we are increasingly getting both socialism and a moral breakdown with flagrant lawlessness as a result of our evolutionary thinking. Because God's moral law is denied, men are increasingly living in terms of their sinful nature and their lawless demands for self-satisfaction. In a recent article on New York City, detective George Barrett, the author, reported on the collapse of law and order as seen from Barrett's perspective:

"If Barrett hates the bad guys, he grieves for the good. He walks through the west side of the precinct, among the crowded apartment houses, and he points to the heavy wire screens and bars covering the back windows over the alleys and empty lots. "Look at that," he says, "They have to make prisons for themselves to keep the germs out. They have to hide themselves behind bars."²¹

In many cities today, similar conditions prevail: the good citizens make prisons of their own homes to protect themselves from the hoodlums who rule the streets.

One prominent oil man commented on the moral breakdown by observing that backward areas of the world, which fifty years ago were the less safe areas of travel, are now safer than the streets of America. The reason for this is not that these areas have improved; they have not. It is because the total moral nihilism and anarchism of evolutionary thinking is creating a monstrous new barbarian who respects nothing and delights in destruction.

Concerning such a man, David writes, in Psalm 36:1,2: "There is no dread of God before his eyes. For he flatters himself in his own thinking that his iniquity will not be found out or hated."²²

This new barbarism will only continue and increase until creationism is again believed, and with it, Biblical Christianity and Christian moral order again prevail.

(A Canadian colonel who admitted to 86 lurid sex crimes videotaped the brutal rapes and murders of a corporal under his command and another woman. He once flew the plane used to ferry Canada's prime minister, as well as

**Videos You May Have Missed:
A LEBANESE PERSPECTIVE OF ZIONISM**

by Mark Glenn

**2006 AmProm Summer Conference
DVD#CI-503 @ sug don \$15.00**

-----and-----

1. God's Calling Upon Samuel (pts 2&3 of 8)

2. A Cure For Blindness (pt 1 of 10)

3. A Response to Pastor John Hagee

by Pastor Dave Barley

**2006 AmProm Summer Conference
DVD#CI-504 @ sug don \$15.00**



the British Royal family on a visit. A stash of women's undergarments were taken by police from his residence. *Ninemsn* 20/10/10).

Jose Ortega y Gasset termed the specialized scientist of our day a barbarian:

"But if the specialist is ignorant of the inner philosophy of the science he cultivates, he is much more radically ignorant of the historical conditions requisite for its continuation: that is to say: how society and the heart of man are to be organized in order that there may continue to be investigators... He also believes that civilization is there in just the same way as the earth's crust and the forest primeval."²³

Modern men, scientists, and humble believers in evolution alike, are parasites. They are living off the unearned capital of Christian civilization, on the impetus, law, and order of centuries of Christianity. Like all parasites, they are destroying the host body, Christendom, and its collapse will be their death also. They are denying the eternal decree of God, His sovereign and omnipotent creative counsel and decree, and as a result they are left with a world of chaos which is destructive of science.

If they were faithful to their philosophy, these scientists could have no science, because they would have to say that the world is a world of brute factuality, without meaning, purpose, causality, or law. Every time a scientist works in his laboratory, he assumes the reality of God even though he may deny God with his lips. He is thus destroying the very foundations of his science when he denies the God who created all things and who is the source of all law and all interpretation.

The moral capital of Christendom is rapidly disappearing; if it disappears entirely, all culture and civilization will go with it, and the decline and fall of the West will be far more devastating than the decline and fall of Rome.

The only alternative to this decline and fall is a renewal of Biblical Christianity, which requires a return to creationism. This means renouncing any philosophy, study, or science which seeks to act in complete independence of God. It means renouncing the idea of brute factuality, that is, the idea that facts exist apart from God and apart from any interpretation. Because God has created every fact in the universe, every fact must be understood in terms of the interpretation placed upon it by God's creative purpose. We must strive in every area to think God's thoughts after Him. We must believe that, in every area, there are God-ordained truths for man to know, and no other kind of fact and truth exists, only God-created ones.

Evolution says that the universe represents no purpose, plan, or law: it just happened. When we begin with such a total negation, we can only end up with a total negation. As Van Til has observed, a million zeroes still add up only to zero. This moral chaos is prowling our streets, pounding on our doors, and invading our homes. Scientific planning and mental health programs will not cure it: they are merely "scientific" forms of quackery which aggravate rather than alleviate the evil.

The answer is a return to Biblical Christianity, to creationism as a basic factor thereof, to that faith defined by Hebrews 11:13, "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear."

This is the basic truth which all men as God's creatures know, but, as Paul declares, according to the original Greek, they "hold the truth in unrighteousness" (Romans

1:18). They suppress this truth because of their sin, "for the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse" (Romans 1:20).

Not only is creationism a necessary faith; it is an inescapable fact!

notes:

1. Cited by Arnold Lunn, ed., in introduction of Douglas Dewar and H.S. Shelton, *Is Evolution Proved?* (London: Hollis and Carter, 1947), 4.
2. Bernard Ramm, *The Christian View of Science and Scripture* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1955), 168.
3. Robert P. Knight, "Determinism, 'Freedom,' and Psychotherapy," in *Psychiatry* IX, No. 3 (August 1946), 251.
4. *Ibid.*, 262.
5. J.H. Rush, *The Dawn of Life* (Garden City, NY: Hanover House, 1957), 213; cf. 63.
6. Cornelius Van Till, "Our Attitude Toward Evolution," *The Banner*, December 11, 1931, reproduced in *Van Til: Science Articles* (Philadelphia: Westminster Theological Seminary), 12.
7. G.A. Kerkut, *Implications of Evolution* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1960, 1965), 150.
8. *Ibid.*, 155.
9. *Ibid.*, 157.

10. M. Stanton Evans, *The Liberal Establishment* (New York: Devin-Adair, 1965), 178f.

11. Robert Coughlan, "Part I, Behaviour by Electronics," *Life* (54:10, March 8, 1963), 90-106; Coughlan, "Control of the Brain. Part II, The Chemical Mind-Changers," *Life* (54:11, March 15, 1963).

12. *San Francisco Chronicle*, Sunday, Oct. 7, 1956, 4.

13. Humphrey Osmond, MD, in postscript to Gregory Stefan, *In Search of Sanity, The Journal of a Schizophrenic* (New Hyde Park, NY: University Books, 1966), 244f.

14. George Lichtheim, *Marxism: An Historical and Critical Study*

(New York: Frederick A Praeger, 1965, revised edition), 258.

15. Letter of C. Darwin to W. Graham, July 3, 1881, in Francis Darwin, ed., *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin* (New York: Basic Books, 1959), Vol.1, 285.

16. *Ibid.*, 286, same letter.

17. C.F. Weizsacker, *Reports of Geigy Bicentenary Scientific Day*, Basel, Switzerland. June 3, 1958, quoted in Evan Shute, *Flaws in the Theory of Evolution* (London, Canada: The Temside Press, 1961), 238.

18. Leonard de Saint-Yves, ed., *Selected Writings of De Sade* (New York: British Book Centre, 1954), 258; cf. intro., 215f., 237, 248, 253, 256, 266. See also Richard Seaver, Austryn Wainhouse, *The Marquis de Sade ... Writings* (New York: Grove Press, 1965).

19. "Lewd Photos of Dead British Girl Shown," Santa Ana, Calif. *Register* Thursday (m) Dec. 9, 1965.

20. Sigmund Freud, *The Future of an Illusion* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1927), 691.

21. James Mills, "The Detective," condensed from *Life*, December 3, 1966, in *Reader's Digest*, February 1966, 245.

22. H.C. Leupold's translation in *Exposition of the Psalms* (Columbus, OH: Wartburg Press, 1959), 293.

23. Jose Ortega y Gasset, *The Revolt of the Masses* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1932), 126.

Courtesy Faith for all of Life, PO Box 158, Vallecito CA 95251-9989

THE PROMISE OF JONADAB

by E. Ray Moore & Gail Pinckney Moore

(Reviewed by Lee Duigon)

Once upon a time there was a man who, seeing his country disintegrate culturally, believed the prophets who warned of God's impending judgment.



To ensure that his family would survive the catastrophe, he devised a set of rules to be followed by one generation after another. His descendants kept the rules, and survived - and were still obeying them 250 years later; at which point God promised them that this faithful family would be preserved forever. Would you like something like that to happen to your family? Read on!

This is the story of Jonadab. It's from the Bible, best known from Jeremiah 35. With a little Biblical detective work, Ray and Gail Moore have traced it back to First and Second Kings; and with a little inspiration, they have applied it to the needs of today.

JONADAB'S RULES

There is a note of urgency in this handsome little book (151 pages). "The tentacles that reached across Israel and seized Judah," the Moores write, "are not unlike the social malady today in Western culture spreading into the Church" (p.58). And, "If moral decline continues [in the Western world] without repentance and revival, these nations could experience fundamental changes as a result of God's judgment" (p.38).

How fundamental? The inhabitants of Israel and Judah - those who survived the wars and massacres - were uprooted from their land and marched off to captivity in foreign countries. That was the kind of calamity Jonadab planned for his family to escape.

God has not yet told us specifically what form of judgment will overtake the West if its people do not change their ways. But we know from Scripture that judgment will come and, like Jonadab, we wonder what we must do if our families and posterity are to survive.

Jonadab's descendants - called "Rechabites" in Jeremiah 35, after Jonadab's ancestor (father) - followed three family rules (in addition, of course, to obeying God's Laws as given throughout the Bible):

* To abstain from wine. (good advice for some to heed today, as well!)

* To raise herds for a living, rather than engage in agriculture (along with the next rule it made for easy removal to another place to avoid the captivity)

* To live in tents, in the open, rather than in houses in a city. (Avoiding living in cities is still a good idea).

Why such rules? Because Jonadab was convinced that disaster was coming - which it did - and these would help his family escape it.

* Quick, clear thinking might be called for at any time: hence the need to stay sober.

* Herds of sheep and goats are portable sources of food and income; farms are not portable.

* Tents are portable; houses aren't.

Jonadab's rules made sense to his descendants. By keeping them, they escaped from Assyria's conquest of Israel. Generations later, with Babylonian armies swarming into Judah, the Rechabites were ready to escape again.

SOME EXAMPLES

The Moores' purpose is to promote the idea of a "Christian family legacy" (p.11) - how to start one, how to keep it going, and why such a legacy is desirable. Jonadab is their model - not that they're advising their modern readers to become nomadic herdsmen.

If a family can live in a godly manner, generation after generation, God will bless them. "Here is the promise of Jonadab; model him if you dare. 'Jonadab the son of Rechab shall not lack a man to stand before me FOR EVER!'" (p.21).

Jonadab is not the only model given here. We also read of a pastor in Massachusetts carrying on a family tradition that came to America with the Puritans; a multigenerational family of missionaries; an Arab Christian family persisting over many generations in hostile, Muslim Egypt; a Scottish family from the nineteenth century; a German Christian family that survived both Nazism and communism; and the Moore's own experiences in raising their children. With the exception of the Scots family, these are all people whom the Moores have known personally - so they are writing about something that can and has been done.

A GODLY LEGACY

So, how do you build a godly legacy for your family? The Moores break it down into five steps.

* First, *hear God's Word*. Jonadab wouldn't have acted if he had not heard God's prophets and believed them. Those words are still available, in your Bible.

* Next, *cultivate a zeal for God's holiness*. Anyone can hear God's Word - but godly people respond to it, love it, and delight in abiding by it. [i.e. don't bring phones into God's House; don't fall asleep; dress according to His presence, etc]

* Then, *order family life around God's Word*. As the

Moores explain it, "Each family has a culture created by its own special rituals to instill order and discipline. The believing Christian family incorporates habits of godliness and a clear plan to pass on the Christian faith to succeeding generations as part of the family culture" (p.56). [get into the habit of having everyone remain seated at the table during meals - start with asking for the blessing, finish with Bible reading (a

chapter a day, after the evening meal is good), and finish with thanksgiving - only then {little} people can leave the table, instilling a habit of order]

It seems so simple and obvious - but this is the very thing American Christians have failed to do! We have behaved as if Christian faith and doctrine could be inherited, like hair color, and did not have to be painstakingly built up and reinforced over a lifetime. If Christianity seemed to be our default position fifty or sixty years ago, certainly we treated it as such. We took our nation's Christianity for granted, did nothing to maintain it or protect it, and have allowed it to evaporate. Hence the true and pressing need for this book. [many Christians are now like the pigs they try to avoid eating, by eating without praying].

* Next, *set standards for the family*, reasonably and sensibly based on God's Word. Unreasonable standards won't do: they'll only invite disobedience. [the above are NOT unreasonable].

The Moores are careful to remind their readers that children must see their parents living by the rules. Setting a good example is important [and if you had that good example, do it and pass it on], as it always is. If the kids don't see Mom and Pop reading the Bible, they'll think they won't have to read it anymore when they're adults. [and while it is good to read it in private, they don't see that - so read it at the table, and start that habit early in your married life].

* Finally, *protect the family's godly legacy*. The world will always be trying to tear it down. "A modern Jonadab surely would not allow 'Baal dolls' in his home, nor would he listen willingly to 'Baal music' playing from the local radio station" (p.49). For "the American and Western culture is at war with the family, with Biblical parenting and with Christian faith" (p.64).

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

The Moores stress the need for full-time, comprehen-

Special clearance:
Tapes by Earl F Jones - lots of 10 only!
These ex-loan tapes are being cleared
out to make space available.
Available at this time are tapes
C-001 through C-058
Only one of each - be quick
Only \$1 ea in lots of 10



sive Christian education for all Christian children, either at a Christian school (not all church schools are Christian) or in Homeschooling. As president of Frontline Ministries and director of the Exodus Mandate, R. Ray Moore has long been a consistent advocate of Christian schooling.

The case against public education cannot be put too strongly; it's hard to put it strongly enough. One house of Sunday school can hardly compete with five days a week devoted to systematic anti-Christian teachings. It's asking too much to expect a child to keep his Christianity in such a determinedly hostile environment: the fact that some of them do is no excuse.

Facts and figures? Yes, the Moores have them. "Christian children and youth today do not routinely follow the faith of their fathers" (p.97), as a number of polls and surveys clearly show. Pew Forum research in 2007 showed only 15 percent of *church youth* - don't even ask about the kids who are not in church - to be "deeply committed" Christians (p.88). But by comparison, a 2004 survey of some 7,000 home-schooled children found that 93 percent of them "continued in the Christian faith and practices of their parents through their early adult years" (p.99).

You simply can't put your kids through public schools today and reasonably expect them to grow up into solid Christians. Yes, it could happen - but the schools do everything in their power to prevent it. To argue against the wealth of data proving this assertion is to be self-delusional. It may even be a form of moral sloth.

WHY BUILD GODLY FAMILIES?

Why is it desirable to pass godliness down through many generations? "The moral and theological freefall of the Christian family in the West is undeniable," say the Moores (p.96). That makes godliness a matter of survival.

"Although the defense of an ordered society may break down, a hedge can be built around a family for protection" (p.60).

As our nations seem to sleepwalk through a minefield of public and private debt, an out-of-control government, sexual anarchy and radical moral confusion, blatant sin enthroned as law and public policy, and the willful rejection of Holy Scripture by apostate churches - to name just a few of the perils that beset us - it would certainly seem that our families need a hedge of protection. Faithfulness to God, obedience to His word, and continuity within the family over time; these are the elements with which Jonadab built such a hedge around his family. And we can do the same.

No one knows what will become of Western civilization, which proudly calls itself "post-Christian" even as it slides down the chute into history's rubbish heap. But as God saved Jonadab's family during times of crisis, so He will save anyone's family who puts his trust in Him (people who trust God do not take out insurance - they tithe instead).

There is another reason for teaching families to be persistently godly. Such families, and plenty of them, are how we may best repair and renew our culture from the bottom up. It's a mistake to think we can repair it from the top down, say the Moores. "No political solution appears to exist currently to right the moral and cultural decay in the West. We cannot vote ourselves out of the crisis... Political activism does not build strong Christian families, necessary to any stable and moral society, yet Western governments

grow more hostile and adversarial to the Christian Church and family. [that's why it is so important for people to get together in enclaves of Christian Church communities in order to survive as such]. *Laws being enacted will make further persecution of the Christian Church and family inevitable*" (pp.141-142; emphasis added).

ONE FAMILY'S RULES

The Moores list the "home rules" they've established for their family (p.118).

- * Family celebrations and traditions.
- * Brothers and sisters regarded as permanent friends. (and how many Christian parents have been dismayed by some of the "friends" their children picked up in the schools or at work?)
- * Regular worship, Bible reading and study, praise and singing together, Scripture memory.
- * Supper together around the table without a television [as stated above, with prayer and thanksgiving and Bible reading - and no one is excused until all is finished].
- * Short accounts when we have sinned.
- * Practical holiness.
- * Correction for disobedience, disrespect, stealing, and lying.
- * Homeschooling or Christian schooling.
- * Showing respect for parents and others in authority.

"Raising a family for God does not just happen," they add, "Children do NOT arrive on our doorsteps as obedient Christian disciples" (p.119).

Is any of this easy? Of course not. "Isolation from events is impossible," the Moores grant (p.122). Yes, sooner or later, your children are going to want to know what those *Twilight* books and movies are all about: and they're going to want to know about worse things, too. But the longer it can be delayed by being isolated, the better.

"We can ultimately go nowhere on this earth to escape all problems. We must lovingly engage our cul-

ture for Jesus Christ without being overcome ourselves" (p.123). A very strong Biblical foundation is indispensable. The corrupt culture in which we all must live never rests from its work of moral erosion. But in the long run, "Our security is in God alone" (p.123); "God's justice will prevail" (p.125); and "The righteous will be rewarded" (p.126).

The Promise of Jonadab is available on www.amazon.com, or it can be ordered directly from the publisher.

We recommend it because we agree with Ray and Gail Moore that Western culture is in a very bad way, and families had better make a plan to protect themselves [do not trust in your own 'arms' of flesh]. The best plan is to trust in God and live by His Word... generation after generation, after generation...

We don't know what's coming down the road. It might be destruction; or it might be repentance, revival, and renewal. If we, like Jonadab, put our families in a right relationship to God - and teach our children to do the same for their children - we can be sure that God will bless us. And the other side is, if we don't... we won't be blessed!!

Courtesy Faith for all of life, Box 158, Vallecito CA 052

GENERATIONAL MESSAGE

I just had some visitors - this couple came and talked for about 3 hours, and they took some books. We had a

Small booklet

THE POWER OF SUGGESTION

by Paul Bunch

How mass hypnosis, mass

Brainwashing and superstition control people and how to defend your mind against it.

Salvation from Superstition; Faith in Truth; Convictions; The marks of a Scam; Untruthful Information; Ambiguous Information; Appeal to the senses; Double-talk; Fear Tactics; Conditioned Response.

Reprinted from Ben Williams' newsletter.

#022 @ sug don \$2.85



good conversation. They agree that we need to get closer together or we, and the message (Israel-Kingdom-Identity) will die out, as most others in Australia who in the past were also propagating this message have now gone.

The next generation, (if not sincere and dedicated enough to get into an Ecclesia/church/community situation where they need to fellowship on a weekly basis in order to pass on the heritage to their children's children) will see their children drift away and be lost to the body of Christ. Everyone needs to be dedicated and committed to work together as a Christian ecclesia where the children may learn the habit of family worship.

Weekly attendance at fellowship/church has to be instilled at an early age. Just like Jesus "as His custom was, went into the synagogue [the meeting place] on the sabbath day." Custom, habit, something learnt by repetition. Are YOU doing this (with your children), and teaching them? Or are your children going to frequent the halls of mainstream 'Judeo-Christian' churches, and learn to despise (their) Identity?

Many want to be "on their own" to do their own thing; in the meantime they are destroying everything that had been laid out for them when they were growing up. I have said before, if Pharaoh had wanted to destroy Israel, all he needed to do was disperse them all over Egypt, like our people are dispersed today. They would have disappeared into Egyptian society.

By keeping them in the same geographic locale (Goshen), they (eventually) had marriage partners of their own racial kin of the same mindset.

Yes, they were in sin - as we all are - and they had lost a lot of what they had before; hence the Law had to be given again with a new calendar at Mount Sinai. But if the next generation is looking for God's blessing, they need to have that ecclesia fellowship, as was established in the New Testament churches. There they had fellowship and spouse choices. And probably among people who kept genealogical records.

Are you concerned about the next eight generations of your offspring? I am! I want to see my offspring still walking in this way 250 years down the track. Serving the God of their forefathers, and singing His praise; don't you??

By forsaking the assembling of yourselves together (with like-minded Israel-Identity believers), you are doing yourself and your children, and your children's children, the greatest disservice.

Remember - it is easy to go with the flow and slide on the tide - but it's a real battle to go upstream and fight against everything coming the other way!

Think on these things!

Hank Roelofs - CIM

SEX RUSSIAN ROULETTE CAN BACKFIRE

I find it increasingly baffling as to the federal and state governments' and health boards' reasoning behind their concerns to do with overeating and tobacco use and excessive alcohol and drug abuse. To my understanding if they were genuine in wanting to bring about a more health conscious Australia, they would be even more selective on people's detrimental lifestyles.

The ones mentioned above are indeed of grave importance by why on earth are those who play Russian roulette

with their sexual lifestyles - and who are daily putting at risk members of this society by increasingly transmitting deadly and infectious diseases that at one time, though not eliminated, were well and truly under control.

For instance, HIV/AIDS, viral Hepatitis and sexually transmissible infections are on the increase in Australia, as they are worldwide. Sadly, and not surprisingly, all of these are on the increase in mainly homosexual lifestyles. Upon further website investigation it can be found that Syphilis has become re-established in the male homosexual population.

Also prevalent is Gonorrhoea and Chlamydia, and these are increasing at an alarming rate and diseases called Shigellosis and Amebiasis. In the industrial world this disease, Amebiasis, is virtually unknown, but this is definitely going to change.

In the past 40 years we have seen death and misery and families destroyed through a sexually self-indulgent society. Honestly, what does it take to awaken a community and show a lifestyle that is genuine in caring to all we have contact with?

I believe that all levels of Government and all parents should be having a duty of care to protect the overall health and safety of their families and their communities by being made aware of the dangers of a sexually promiscuous lifestyle.

W. Williams, Oxenford

Gold Coast Sun (letter) 1/09/10

Courtesy Saltshakers

If you live in Victoria, NOW is the time to start thinking about your vote - the election is on Saturday 27th November 2010.

Unfortunately, on several important moral issues, MPs from both major political parties have supported immoral laws.

In the abortion debate, John Brumby, leader of the Labor Party supported the Bill; so did the leader and deputy leader of the Liberal party - Ted Baillieu and Louise Asher. On the other hand, there are pro-life MPs in both the Liberal and Labor Parties - though there are more in the Liberal Party.

Peter Ryan, Nationals leader, voted against the Bill as did Peter Kavanagh of the DLP. Check the Life Vote website to see how YOUR MPs voted on the Abortion Bill.

Courtesy Saltshakers, PO Box 6049, WANTIRNA VIC 3152.

We are getting close to the end of another calendar year. By the time you read this, Reformation Day [when Martin Luther nailed his 95 thesis to the Castle Church door at Wittenberg, in 1517] will have passed with most people not even knowing about it. Instead they will be getting involved with pagan "Halloween Parties."

Unfortunately we have also been feeling the pinch from economic downturn, as the purchase of material has declined markedly in the last several months. Please continue to support us with the purchase of material, and with the addition of new people (preferably your next generations) as subscribers to our *Messenger*. Many of our older *Messengers* can now be downloaded from our **website**.

Our sincere thanks goes out to those faithful few whose help makes it possible to continue with this remaining Australian-based Israel-Identity message publication. We appreciate your letters and news clippings, and your requests for material. We had a delay because of a printer problem, but hopefully we are over that now.

May our God continue to bless and protect you and keep you safe,

