



# Christian Identity Ministries

A member of the  
Congregations of Israel

PO Box 146, CARDWELL, QLD, 4849, Australia

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

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

#351

## Covenant Messenger

August AD2015

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

### THE BIBLE, RACE AND CULTURE by Arnold Kennedy

#### INTRODUCTION

Some Christians are vaguely aware that there are differences in the way that God treats various races in the Bible. When they ponder it, they find a crisis in belief. This paper is written as a response to questions from seekers after Truth who have a genuine doctrinal crisis in their understanding as to what "*The Sovereignty of God*" really means, when God says of Israel, "*You only have I known of all the families of the earth*"-(Amos 3:2). The exclusiveness of Israel typified by the word "only" is consistent. They have seen that there is a unity between both Testaments especially in regard to God being sovereign in choosing Israel. They have seen that the whole Bible is essentially the "Drama of God's People." They have become aware that the word 'redemption' can only apply to Israel as a race, and that no statement to the contrary can be found in Scripture. Immediately there is a conflict between this and the traditional teachings that "*all the world,*" "*every*" and "*whosoever*" means every race of earth. There is a crisis in belief between these two convictions. We will quote just three Scriptures establishing the link between both Testaments in regard to Israel. The emphasized words show the limited application.

"*Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you.*" Acts 3:22.

"*And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children.*" (Acts 13:32).

"*Now I say that Jesus the Anointed was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers.*" (Romans 15:8).

From here we can go on to look at the crisis in belief. The first thing raised in people's minds are those instances where there is a change in behaviour, and what appears to be a move of God, in those races which obviously are not of the Israel nations. True, we have in Scripture statements about certain races, such as "*Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated*" found in both Testaments, but as a general statement about all other non-Israel races together, we cannot find positive indication about them. If we go back to the Scripture in Amos above, we can see a statement that does not indicate that the other races, not being addressed, are being judged in the same way as Israel:

"*Hear this word that the LORD hath spoken against*

*you, O children of Israel, against the whole family which I brought up from the land of Egypt (the importance of extended family remaining very close together), saying, You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities. Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" Amos 3:2.*

"Known" is in the perfect tense which means the action was completed in the past and cannot be added to. These are the same people who are described as being "*fore-known*" in the New Testament.

The normal reaction expressed by people when they are presented with God being sovereign in choosing Israel, are usually something like:

1. "Everyone else then is going to hell," or
2. "The Negro cannot have a soul," or
3. "God would not do that."

But these are all presumptions. The Book of Amos that has been quoted confirms judgments upon certain other races based upon their treatment of Israel. There are judgments upon certain mixed races (products of adultery), e.g. Zech 14:21, "*And in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the LORD of hosts.*" But there is a balance of races about which we can find no direct reference. At the end of the age we find a New Jerusalem with only the remnant of Israel on the inside, but there are still other races outside.

#### IN THIS ISSUE:

The Bible, Race, and Culture, .....	1
A Full Quiver, .....	6
The Confederate Flag Needs to be Raised, .....	7
Just Eat the Mustard, .....	10
Christian Economics: The Hidden Baal, .....	11
Might Makes Right, .....	12
Adam de Witt Answers, .....	13
The Present Reign of Jesus the Christ, .....	14
Our Real Enemies, .....	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.

The purpose of this paper is to highlight the fact that the Bible does not support the popular “*Brotherhood of man*” concept. We will look at ‘race’ from the non-Biblical viewpoint, and then from the Biblical viewpoint. After this we will show examples from Scripture to demonstrate that God treats races differently, in both Testaments. Connected doctrinal issues are then looked into briefly.

### The Popular Racial-Equality View

The popular argument that all races are equal in God’s sight goes like this- [from an Internet source]

“The Bible addresses the idea of racial and cultural divisions in terms of “partiality.” Partiality means showing undue favour for one person or group over another. The books of the law warn against showing partiality in legal decisions (Leviticus 19:15, Deut. 1:17, 16:19). The Bible’s prohibitions against this type of judgment are based on God’s own character; for He does not show partiality toward any person (2 Chron. 19:7), and He will not allow those who follow Him to judge others on the basis of external factors such as wealth, cultural background, or ethnic identity.

This view of impartiality was the foundation of the Great Commission. The book of Acts speaks of Peter’s discovery that Christ had intended the Gospel for all men, regardless of race or culture. As he was trying to be faithful to the practice of exclusion taught by the Pharisees, Peter was shown a vision of “*wild beasts, creeping things, birds of the air,*” which traditional Judaism had declared unclean. When Peter refused to “*kill and eat,*” God said to him, “*What God has cleansed you must not call common*” (10:15). This was yet another epiphany for the headstrong apostle. Luke writes, “*Then Peter opened his mouth and said: ‘In truth I perceive that God shows no partiality. But in every nation whoever fears Him and works righteousness is accepted by Him’*” (Acts 10:34-35). And later Paul confirms that message: “*For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus*” (Galatians 3:27-28).

The apostle James later warned that any attempt to show partiality or judgment against those of other races and cultures, particularly because of economic status, was inconsistent with the teachings of Christ (James 2:1). James declared partiality is a sin (2:9). Paul also warned the Ephesians who held slaves to be fair in their dealings with their servants, for God Himself is impartial and, for those who are in Christ Jesus, the master is no better than the slave and the employer greater than the employee (6:9).”

Some of the questions that have to be answered here are: 1. If the Bible references here are all addressed to equality amongst Israelites, how could this be extended to include all other races?

2. If God’s prohibition against racial discrimination is based upon His character, how could God determine that Israel should exterminate some races?

3. If the “Great Commission” was directed to all races rather than to “all men” of Israel, why were the disciples and apostles told no to go, “*but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel*”? [Matt.10:6]. Why did Jesus say, “*I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the House of Israel*” - (Matt. 15:24) and not to other races?

4. In Peter’s vision, in the 28th verse of Acts 10, why are the words “another nation” [or *alloghulos=another tribe of the same sort*] changed to mean a race of a different sort?

5. Where in prophecy are the two parties in Acts 10:15 other than the House of Israel and the House of Judah?

6. In Acts 10:34, Israel was dispersed amongst “every nation,” why then is the limiting, “*The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: He is Lord of all*” ignored and extended to all other races?

7. In the phrase, “*there is neither Jew [Judean] nor Greek,*” how does “Jew” come to mean all Israel and “Greek” come to mean every other race on earth?

8. In James 2:9, where is there any suggestion that other ethnic cultures are included since “partiality in the law” can only refer to Israel who alone were given that covenant Law (Psalm 147:19-20)?

### Race

When we use the word “race” we usually think of people who are different from others, mostly because of obvious appearance/genetic distinctions. But there are many ideas about what we mean by the word ‘race’. Dictionaries do not agree whether it is a matter of ancestry or whether it is a matter of culture and environment. Christians too are capable of saying, and believing, quite different things about ‘race’ at the same time:

1. That all people are of one race because of the popular teaching that all people originate from Adam. —This is where the idea comes from that all races and cultures are the same in God’s sight. This is the subject which we will be examining. From this teaching come the expressions, “*The human race*” and “*Adam’s race.*” What many Christians are ignorant of, and are not taught, is that God separated the sons of Adam, and why He set boundaries between the races. Deut. 32:8,

“.....When He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel.” We will look at the popular argument about the equality of the races in the next section.

2. That there is a ‘*chosen race,*’ and from this they have invented the expression, “*The Jewish Race.*” —The latter expression would mean that the “Jews” are somehow different from the rest of the Human Race, even if they are part of it. If we agree that there is a chosen race, then we must agree that all other races are ‘*un-chosen.*’ But, Jewish written authorities agree that there is no such thing as a “Jewish” race, as a genetic lineage. When we replace the word “Jewish” with “Israelite” we will be approaching the real Biblical position.

3. That there is a radical and racial separation between “Israel” and what is usually called “The Church.” —Although proponents will declare that they are not ‘racist,’ they effectively are just that by making the separation. They try to get over their problem by saying that God treats different people differently in different dispensations through history. Here, Dispensationalism joins with the Covenant Theology of Calvinism in seeking to draw a sharp distinction between the law and the gospel, and insists upon a complete disjuncture between God’s workings with Israel and His workings with “The Church.” They must have awful problems when it comes to ‘identity’ because the Bible connects both the Law and Grace to Israel, and to Israel only.

4. That the “*seed of Abraham*” are those of any race who have faith and belief in Jesus Christ.— They have to ignore two things: (a) That in Galatians 3:16, *Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ,* that “*Christ*” here is a verbal adjective

### New LOAN ONLY Video:

### TRACE AMOUNTS

*Autism, Mercury, and the hidden Truth. Could a tragedy, which brought one of the greatest nations to its knees and stole a generation of children, have been avoided? During the past 20 years, the frequency of autism has skyrocketed from 1 in 10,000 to 1 in 68, and the scientific community is no closer to determining a cause. True story of Eric Gladen.*

**CI-996 @ sug LOAN don \$7**



indicating that it is the seed of Abraham itself that is 'anointed.' (b) That the promises made to Abraham were confirmed to Isaac and Jacob as well, as a lineage, and that Jesus made it a matter of belief and faith within these people. These are whom He said He was sent to, saying, "I was not sent but to the lost sheep of the House of Israel."-(Matt. 15:24). But who believes Jesus today about this?

5. That the "seed of Abraham" is racial, as a family of "the stock of Abraham" - (Acts 13:26).

This is the only view that shows Scripture to be consistent through both Testaments. Here the 'elect' is confined to Israel. (Isaiah 45:4, *For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect*). Israel's redemption from the curse of the broken Law is through the New Covenant which is made with the House of Judah and the House of Israel only-(Heb. 8:8 and prophesied in Jer. 31:31).

Christians will switch from one idea to one of the other ideas to support a particular doctrine, and it seems never to occur to them what they are doing. They can invent doctrines to try to cover a particular view. Clergy come to the point where they have to say, "There are many explanations," and then they become experts at trying to explain things away. But, it bothers very few of them and professing Christians do not seem to think things through. The 'race' issue seems to be too difficult or contradictory, or otherwise they may say, because of what they have been taught, it does not matter anyway. But it does matter and God makes this clear. Our part is to believe what God says. Then everything clarifies and becomes consistent. If God was not consistent in what He says, then His Word would not be worth consideration. When we take a high view of Scripture and base our beliefs upon its accuracy, that we find it to be a Rock that is rock-solid. It is some traditional teachings and some translations that create the problems and conflicts.

This paper is written by a Christian for Christians to help those who have genuine confusion, and for those who want to 'dig deep' and know 'the certainty of those things.'

### The Non-Biblical Viewpoint on 'Race'

Webster's Universal Dictionary gives the origin of the word 'race' and uses the word 'blood,' saying, "A group of individuals possessing certain physical characteristics in common, and regarded as being of one blood and sprung from the same original stock." With a definition like this it would be valid to say that different races are of different blood. The word 'stock' conveys the idea in the historic understanding.

But today, in modern usage, this meaning is denied because it is considered to be politically incorrect to suggest that there are meaningful genetic differences between peoples of differing colours and origins. Most modern dictionaries confirm that there has been this modern change in meaning. For instance, from the Grollier Electronic Publishing we find:

*"The overwhelming bulk of scientific opinion in both the social and the biological sciences, however, now rejects the notion that large human populations, such as the so-called white, black, and yellow races, behave differently because of their physical appearance, or that they can be said to be genetically superior or inferior to one another. Genetic differences between population groups do exist of course. None of these group differences, however, has yet been shown to affect personality, intelligence, or indeed, any ability that significantly relates to social behaviour."*

This is trying to say that the genetic differences do not

relate to behaviour or performance. This would then mean that the poor attainment and the relatively more flagitious (extremely and criminally wicked) mind found in some groups is a matter of culture. Say this was so in the case of the 'Maori' as a group culture, then why have an agenda to impose such a culture upon another group through education, etc? Speaking of attainment, when racehorses are bred, we would not expect superior performance from mating a high performing horse with another horse which has no history or expectation of good performance. Nor would we mate a good horse with a donkey and expect to win races with the offspring. If the horse genus has genetic differences, is it unreasonable to suspect that the human genus likewise may have varying genetic differences and attainments? Connection between genetic differences and intelligence has always been an emotive matter. We say that a person born with Down's Syndrome has a genetic defect from conception and yet we have no trouble in relating intelligence differences to genetics here. The science of genetics is all about equal opportunity and equal endowment! But, in the Bible the issue involves spirit endowment and this endowment is from conception. The factor does not change with environment. This dictionary goes on to say, "In common usage, race is a socially defined term."

This partially contradicts the underlined portion in the quote above where genetic differences are admitted, but what is not admitted is that genetic differences have connection with traditional behaviour patterns within one shared physical environment.

So, within the modern dictionaries we find contradictions. The above article goes on to speak about "hybridization" and "gene flow," and that races can be classified on a geographical basis, namely the Ethiopian, the Palaearctic and the Oriental, and then goes on to say:

*"Recent evidence indicates how far apart these populations have become in their*

*genetic endowments."*

*"Blood groups show a striking split into Eastern and Western branches."*

*"Populations through adaptation to local different environments are called races."*

These are contradictory claims! So again, on the one hand it is said that racial differences are genetic, and on the other hand some say that they are environmental. It is sometimes claimed that the phenotype expression of a genotype depends upon the environment in which the genotype develops.

In New Zealand, we have Case Law in *The Crown v. King-Ansell*, which went through to the Court of Appeal [C.A.176/78] where judgment was made on matters of race and ethnicity. Here the complex nature of the subject is presented, but for anyone wanting to understand the modern view of race and ethnicity more fully, the book, "*Who Are The Jews*" by Christian Borg published by Veritas Publishing P/L. (doesn't seem available any longer), is recommended, because it gives a transcript of the actual case. It is good reading and shows how the historical and traditional meanings given to 'race' are now denied. We will now go on to see what modern Jewish authorities have to say.

**From the Encyclopedia Judaica, 1971** [under 'Race, Theory of']

*"Nowadays, although anthropologists differ over the exact number and subdivisions of the races of humanity, most are agreed that the characteristics which distinguish races are limited*

### New Videos:

## THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN CAPITALISM, (on 3 discs)

*Traces the beginnings of the Vanderbilts, John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and J.P. Morgan, and the conniving, skullduggery and blackmail that went on for them to become so rich. Look after your workers by giving them less pay and longer hours. And Henry Ford, who reversed that trend.*

**CI-997 (a, b, and c) @ \$20 posted**



to physical features. This conclusion is, however, of comparatively recent date." -- and:

"On this subject, the Talmud states, 'for the sake of peace among creatures, the descent of all men is traced back to one individual, so that one may not say to his neighbour, "my father is greater than yours" [Sanh. 4:5]. Belief on a common descent from Adam was taken over by Christianity, and became one of the fundamentals of the Christian principle of equality of all men before God."

Two important things to note here are the mention of a "comparatively recent date," and "was taken over by Christianity." Both of these statements indicate that both ideas were not the original beliefs. The "fundamentals of the Christian principle of the equality of all men before God" is not a Biblical concept as we will show.

Comment on Dictionary Definitions and the International Covenants

Looking at the definitions within these dictionaries, we can conclude that there are inconsistencies, if not deliberate changes as well. On the one hand, 'race' is said to be a matter of origins and genealogical line, whilst on the other hand it is social, cultural and the product of environment. 'Culture' and 'race' do tend to coincide, we all know.

The International Covenant On Human Rights speaks primarily of a person having "civil and political rights" as well as "economic, social and cultural rights," and that "all peoples have the right to self determination," and adds that "by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their social and cultural development." It treats, "every member of the human family, everywhere," as being the same making no provision at all for genealogical lines as Scripture does. Indeed, if race is just social and cultural, then any person could "freely pursue" what race they wanted to become and then be classed as being of that race. This seems to be agreed to in ILO Convention No. 169. Origins and 'family' no longer have historical meaning under the International Covenants.

The New Zealand Human Rights Act, 1993, provides for a Race Relations Commissioner, but is unable to give a definition of what 'race' is. In this area this Act prohibits discrimination on the grounds of "religious belief, ethnical belief, race, colour, and ethnic or national origins." But again, although it mentions race without defining what it is, it does not treat any of these as relating to genealogical lines or descent, apart from allowing multi-racial Jewry to be the one exception. Attempts to obtain a quantitative definition from Government and Race Relations as to what a 'Maori' is, for instance, have been fruitless. Until the 1960s a Maori was a person of 50% Maori blood or above, in law. Now, 'Race' is supposed to be a matter of belief or culture.

#### The Biblical Viewpoint on 'Race'

'Race' in the Bible is in the sense of genealogical descent from a person who is then known as the 'father' of that race. This is shown in statements like:

"The same is the father of the Moabites" Gen. 19:37

"The same is the father of the children of Ammon" Gen .19:38.

"And these are the generations of Esau, the father of the Edomites" Gen. 36:9.

From this point on, through Scripture, each group with such a 'father' is treated as being a different race with dif-

ferent destinies. Each then are treated as being from differing 'stock.'

The sons and grandsons of Abraham are the issue of his loins, and descent is carefully traced **through the male line** to him. Scripture indicates that there is something genetic in the line because when his immediate offspring took wives, they were to be of the same stock as Abraham (from Mesopotamia). What we do know is that God placed the letter 'H' into the names of Abram and Sara, making these names Abraham and Sarah. This 'number of the spirit' indicates the placement of a 'spirit' endowment. This carries on within the offspring from Abraham to his **physical descendants** through Isaac who took a wife from the same 'family.' In the modern view of genetics, there is no provision for 'spirit,' and racial and heredity traits are claimed to be solely the product of genetic 'flow' coupled with environmental factors.

God is spoken of as "*The Father of Israel*" and this is said directly of no other race in the Bible - [e.g. Exodus 4:22-23]. From this it can be said that Israelites are *the children of God*.-[Gr. *teknon*] from conception. Children are the offspring of a 'father' who begat them. In the Bible, men '*beget*' children from conception, whereas children are '*born*' of a woman at birth. James 1:18 addressing the twelve tribes, speaks of God, "*Of His own will begat He us.*" Only those referred to as "us" in context are 'begotten' with the 'spirit' potential to become the *sons of God* - [Gr. *huios*]. It is clear from Scripture that all races cannot *hear* and all races cannot *receive the things of God*. Jesus said unto His disci-

ples, "*Because it is given to you to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, but unto them it is not given*" - [Matt.13:11]. The "*them*" in this case were the Edomite leaders of the Judean nation who, in the main, were not Israelites - [John 8:39][see If People Will Not Hear on page 14]. It is reasonable here to relate the genetic base of Abraham's seed through Isaac to the 'spirit' placed within this race; Abraham being the 'father' of this **physical** race from **his loins**. This physical race had a 'spirit' which could *witness with God's spirit that they were the children of God*" - [Rom. 8:16]

In Scripture we are not given much detail about genetics or technical reasons why an Edomite became different from a Moabite. We can see that one came from incest (Moab and Ammon), whereas this was not the case with the descendants of Esau - although he married forbidden Canaanites. In the case of Jacob and Esau, these were twins of the same gender, but they were like the opposite of identical twins. They were "*two nations and two manner of people*" that would be separated from the womb of their mother - [see Gen. 25:23]. Even with the same parents they had a genetic difference.

One was '*smooth*' and one was "*red, all over like a hairy garment*" [Different genotypes].

One was "*a plain man dwelling in tents*" and one was "*cunning hunter and a man of the field*," [different in aptitudes] One was a "*fornicator*" whereas the other was not [different morals]

One married within his own race, whereas the other did not. [different in obedience].

One valued the birthright, whereas the other despised it [different values].

#### CDs of the Month:

**J-155 Prerequisites to be used by God, pt 1**

**J-156 Prerequisites to be used by God, pt 2**

**J-157 Prerequisites to be used by God, pt 3**

**J-158 Prerequisites to be used by God, pt 4**

**J-159 Acceptable Worship, pt 1**

**J-160 Acceptable Worship, pt 2**

**J-161 Acceptable Worship, pt 3**

*all by pastor John Weaver*



One nation and people were to become subject to the other nation and people-[Gen. 27:29+37]. [different in position].

One was loved by God, but the other was hated by God, even before he was born-[Mal. 1:2-3] Different treatment by God].

One is destined for eternity, but the other is destined to perish for ever [see Numbers 24:20]. [different in destiny].

They were very different in appearance as well as different in behaviour. Because the two brothers were from the same family, the differences between them were not a matter of either physical or social environment! The popular view does not make any allowance for 'spirit' in racial considerations, and it is not unreasonable to view a connection between genetics and 'spirit'. Qualities like fair play and placing value on the sanctity of life and property certainly differ between races, and this is regardless of where each live. The Anglo-Saxon race in particular demonstrates these qualities above all other races, and this is a matter of their 'spirit.'

In the New Age/World Government view, racial appearance has no connection with behaviour, but from experience, few would believe there is no connection, as groups. Biblically, 'race,' is a bloodline. We all know that race and a culture do tend to go together. Culture is defined by anthropologists as, "learned behaviour acquired by individuals as members of a social group." They then claim that a person is "encultured at birth." This then would mean that behaviour would be learned before birth. In other words, they have their behaviour pattern established from the time of being begotten, and before being exposed to any environment. Confirmation of this is shown by say a developing cell after conception, or by a migrating bird on its first flight. How would these learn any behaviour pattern?

There is evidence that genetic make-up can affect behaviour, for instance men whose sex-chromosomes are XYY have been shown to tend towards criminal behaviour. The question here of course is to consider if we blame the XYY situation and other things like multiple personalities on environment, or to race-mixing in the past, or on some other factors? The evidence of multiple personalities within one person also suggests 'spirit' difference between one personality and another, where thinking, behaviour and expressing emotion change according to the personality being presently manifest. The present environment may not have changed between differing personality manifestations, so this is not a matter of environment. A particular personality being manifest may be of another race and language, so this too has no connection with environment. This all does not support the 'politically correct' position.

There can be no suggestion that either individuals or races are equal in their natural endowment. There are tens of thousands of paired genes within each of us and somehow the inequalities between Jacob and Esau were genetic as shown by their physical characteristics being quite different. We might not be able to detail exactly how 'spirit' affects future generations, but Esau was stated to be the

'father' of a race, apparently with a 'spirit' difference to that of the descendants of Jacob. The race of Edomites he fathered feature through scripture, as a race, up to the end of the age, and this fact is commonly ignored by most denominations.

Further to this God treated each of these brothers differently and we are told, "*Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated*" -[Rom 9:13 and Mal. 1:2-3]. We are not specifically told whether or not God loved one and hated the other because of a genetic difference, but this appears to be a matter of 'spirit' endowment which could be associated with different genetic make-up. There is a lot of Scripture about associating "spirit" and "Israel" as a holy seed. It is clear that God's hatred carries on to all of Esau's descendants 'for ever.' This statement immediately puts the Bible 'off side' with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And, of course, few churches want to believe this Bible fact.

In the efforts to say all races are basically the same, it is not "politically correct" to mention any I.Q. differences between races. Those who want to deny this always seem to point to the genetic variation that exists within any given

single human population, the variation being because of varying levels of hybridization. Whilst this variation exists, there still is a wide range of genetic differences manifest in physical, physiological, and biochemical comparisons between all given racial groups as groups. When we talk about I.Q. no one can indicate why the brain should be immune from such comparisons between the races. Sometimes we will hear a remark such as, "They do not think like us," or "their ways are not our ways," and that tells the story because this obvious fact of difference does apply between two races in one physical environment.

We can see propaganda in the media and in education which tries to say that there is no essential genetic differences between the races. Again they point to the variations within a group, but the multitude of books on genetics still point to there being clearly identifiable racial groups separated on a

genetic basis. A serologist can determine which of the major races a blood sample is from. How could this be so if there were not differing bloods? 'Time' Magazine of 7-2-94 speaks about "*Subtle variations between races in white blood types mediate specific immune responses to disease.*" This is saying that such differences do exist! The reasons for body transplant rejections demonstrates that important differences do exist.

The current Human Genome Diversity Project examining blood samples from 600 differing indigenous peoples is to determine the exact location of genes on the respective chromosomes, and this is providing templates of DNA genotypes and leukocyte antigens, and other genetic epidemiological pre-dispositions. Although this has potential benefit in medicine, it has been claimed that the object of the exercise is to facilitate the issue of a computerised Universal Biometrics Card for control, surveillance, or possibly elimination of certain populations by biological weapons or medical treatments. On one hand the propaganda says that

### **New & Recently listened to CDs & DVDs**

**A-7005b *The Simplicity of the Gospel,*  
Sheldon Emry**

**D-038 *Divine Boldness, Water Fire &  
Sword, pt 8, Lawrence Blanchard***

**E-449 *How Did We Get Here?*  
Don Elmore**

**G-944 *Beyond Stained-Glass Windows,*  
G-945 *Give Them Their Due,*  
both Ted Weiland**

**H-139b *Drugs for Israel, Bob Hallstrom***

**J-420 *The Doctrine of Election, pt 3***

**J-421 *The Doctrine of Election, pt 4***

**J-422 *The Doctrine of Election, pt 5***

**3 by John Weaver**

**P-092 *Bold Parenting Seminar, pt 3***

**Jonathan Lindvall**

**U-131 *Hollywood's Most Despised Villain,***

**Geoff Botkin**

**CI-772 *The Genesis 3 attack, Ken Ham***



there is no essential difference genetically between races, but academically will talk when it suits about “*population genetics*,” this being the mathematical consequences of heredity on populations. This then declares that genetic make-up causes racial traits. The criteria used to distinguish racial differences lists physiological and biochemical differences, and by statistical correlation of protein molecules, seven distinct major races or populations can be recognised. A BBC program of February 1997 was about tracing family trees and ancestry, and how efficiently these could be mapped genetically. This was a clear statement that there are precise genetic differences between the races.

We have to decide what the truth is, despite threats of punishment for discrimination, and whether we are going to believe God or man regarding racial separation. The Bible does NOT support the goal of a class-less, sex-less, race-less and nation-less world society, and many Christians are taught that Jesus will bring this to pass at the second advent. But what Jesus does at that time is to restore the Kingdom to Israel-Acts 1:6. This is in accord with Old Testament prophecy. Israel [not the state of Israeli] then rules with God over the other races. The World Government/New Age seeks to eliminate the Israel people with the ‘spirit,’ trying to dilute the ‘spirit’ content, encouraging this by racial intermarriage and promotion of immorality. Elimination is sought through abortion, ‘safe sex,’ together with economic and political measures, to lower birthrates. They will come close to achieving this goal according to scripture. A phrase seen by the author in France in 1966 described this ominously as, “*The final solution of the Anglo-Saxon problem.*” Seemingly they know more about who these Israel people are than the Christian Churches do! And Jesus says, “*Few there be that find it.*”

.....to be continued.....**Races,**  
-----

## A FULL QUIVER

by pastor Jory Steven Brooks, CBIA

With the success of the American cable television series, “**19 and Counting**,” which depicts the lives of the large Duggar family, there has been an interest in what has been called “the QuiverFull movement.” A growing number of conservative Christians are advocating that having large families is a blessing from the Lord. In past centuries large families were common, but in the last several decades we have instead seen the advent of the “nuclear family” of two children, and now the “singleton” family with only one child. Recent studies have found that one-child families, also known as “onelies” or “siblingless” are on the rise.

My parents both came from families of seven children, and both had a wonderful close relationship with their siblings throughout their lives. As a child, I had never heard of the QuiverFull movement, but had always wanted to have a large family too. When I met and married my wife, she was less enthusiastic about the idea of a large family than I was, but after the birth of our first daughter we were planning our second child when the unthinkable happened. My wife was diagnosed with lymphatic cancer, and it was rapidly spreading throughout her body. It did not help her frame of mind that Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis, widow of President

John Kennedy, died the month before my wife was diagnosed with the same disease. The situation was dire, even with chemotherapy treatments, and my wife credits the prayers of the saints in our church congregation for her survival. Still, it was a rough four or five years before the cancer was finally deemed in remission, and her physical health and stamina has never fully recovered. So has ended my quest for a large family!

It may therefore seem a bit hypocritical for me, with only one child, to be an advocate of large **Christian** families, but there is no doubt in my mind that it is best for the individuals as well as the nation. An internet search on “only child” uncovers numerous web-sites in which feelings of emptiness and loss are expressed by the sibling-less, grieving for the brothers and sisters they never had. There are regular ‘only child’ conferences and workshops as well.

What does Scripture say? The full quiver advocates often quote wise King Solomon’s advice in the brief but eloquent Psalm 127 (and 128): “*Except the LORD build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the LORD keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain. It is vain for you to rise up early, to sit up late, to eat the bread of sorrows: for so he giveth his beloved sleep. Lo, children are an heritage of the LORD: and the fruit of the womb is his reward. As arrows are in the hand of a mighty man; so are children of the youth. Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them: they shall not be ashamed, but they shall speak with the enemies in the gate.*”

A few weeks ago, the subject came up during one of our church Bible studies, and someone asked how many arrows are in a full quiver? There were several answers in the room, one person was sure that five was a quiver full, someone else thought fifteen, and I recalled somewhere reading

that it was a dozen. Perhaps all of our answers were correct, as we found in an internet search on the topic.

According to an article posted on answers.com, a full quiver is, “as many as it can hold!” There are a wide variety of quiver and arrow types. Most modern hunting quivers hold somewhere around five. Most medieval quivers were sized to hold between ten and fifteen, with an even dozen being the most commonly alluded to in literature. Personally I have never seen one designed to be carried by a foot archer that would hold more than twenty. It would, of course, be possible to do so, but arrows tend to bulk up quickly, so the practicality is questionable.”

The Duggar family announced recently that they have recently lost in pregnancy their twentieth child, and advancing age may now be a factor in ending their quest for more children. They, as well as the full quiver movement as a whole, have come under increasing attack from atheists and the liberal media. They have been called a “cult” and other derogatory names, although it seems the real reason is that atheists simply fear any increase in the number of Bible-believing Christians. The fact that hateful names are being directed at parents for their personal desire to have children shows the sorry Spiritual state of our country.

Many full quiver parents do indeed want to build an army for God, and author Nancy Campbell (Above Rubies) says that the womb is a “weapon against the adversaries.”

## Old Historic Videos: PLANTING THE FAITH WESTWARD

E. Raymond Capt

*This video shows how the Faith of Christ, brought by the early Christian missionaries from Palestine, reached the far West in the first years of the first century AD, and its resulting impact on the Celtic communities of the Brittanic Isles. After the departure of the Roman occupying forces, the rising stars of the saints: Ninian, Columba, Finian and many others brought Christianity even to the Picts of far north Scotland. Centuries later, seeking freedom of worship the Pilgrims took the Faith across the Atlantic to the New World. Remastered.*

CI-234 @ sug don \$25



No wonder the atheists are on the attack! Michelle and Jim Bob Duggar in particular have been attacked with falsehoods, and have stated, "Even though Wikipedia and some Internet blogs report that we are part of a QuiverFull movement, we are not. We are simply Bible-believing Christians who desire to follow God's Word and apply it to our lives. God says children are a gift and a blessing, and we believe it."

The British Guardian newspaper, in a lifestyle story published in March, 2009, stated, "In 1972, 18 percent of [British] children were living in a one-child household. This had risen to 22 percent in 1981, remaining at a steady level until 1991 and rising again to 24 percent in 2001. By 2007, the last year for which figures are available, 26 percent of the UK's children were living without siblings." The same article also states: "The US Census Bureau reports that women approaching the end of their childbearing years in 2004 had an average of 1.9 children, compared with 3.1 for their 1976 counterparts. In New York, more than 30% of children are 'only' children."

It is likely that the number of singleton children will continue to rise. Is this a good thing? Psychotherapist Bernice Sorenson says, "I've been surprised at the number of people I hear from who have spent their whole life wishing they had a sibling." She says, "Usually they're people who have been brought up in isolated places. They feel a huge lack in their lives. Generally it comes to a head later in their life, especially when their parents get older."

According to the Guardian, "Without a doubt the biggest challenge for 'onlies' is the realization that when your parents need care, the burden will fall squarely on your shoulders, and when they die you will be left alone. At that point, a sibling can be a huge comfort." However, with many siblings, when it comes to caring for elderly parents, it becomes a case of "everybody thought that somebody would do it but nobody did it, and now nobody died."

At the turn of the last century, psychologist Granville Stanley Hall likened being an only child to having a "disease." And in the 1920s, Austrian psychoanalyst Alfred Adler stated that an only child is in danger of suffering egocentricity.

Mary Pride's 1985 book, "The Way Home: Beyond Feminism, Back to Reality," is credited with popularizing the QuiverFull movement. In the book, Pride called family planning "the mother of abortion." This is no doubt yet another reason for the unseemly attack on those who wish to have larger families.

The Bible instructs us in the very first chapter of the book of Genesis, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." (Gen. 1:27-28).

Solomon was surely divinely inspired to see family life as a blessing and our children a wonderful heritage. Let us

encourage our own young people to take Solomon's wise advice!

-----Courtesy TKC, Box 1478, Ferndale WA 98248-----

Some decades ago, we (HR) were contacted by a current affairs TV program who wanted to do a "human interest story" on us, because they had heard we had a large family with 14 children. We declined to be involved with them and requested they keep their distance and not pursue us in this matter - which they complied with, thank God.

Regarding the having of children, it must be remembered that they are to be raised "to the glory of God." So just having and raising children to grow up as Babylonians and be part of the world, is defeating the purpose. If they are bred and raised in Christian communities separated from the world, they can grow to become a force for good. The world already raises enough 'worldly' and 'ungodly' people, without Christians also contributing their children to that effort. That's why it is important to keep away from schools (they all follow a state authorised curriculum, teaching explicit homosexuality), from TV programs and computer games, and from vaccination. If you are going to teach them anything, home school them and give them Scripture memory verses to learn off by heart.

### **Must Have book**

### **THANK GOD!**

### **MY SAVIOUR WAS NOT A JEW!**

**Lt Col Gordon 'Jack' Mohr, A.U.S. ret.**

*Jack was a well-known Baptist lay-evangelist, with over 25 years of speaking experience which took him to 49 states, over 3000 communities and five foreign countries. He became noted for his outspoken stand against liberalism and compromise. He has done extensive study, writing and speaking on the Anglo-Israel Identity Movement and the Jewish question. This 150-page book expands on the latter. "I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews and are not, but are of the synagogue of Satan" (Rev. 2:9).*

**#036 @ sug don \$24.95**

### **THE CONFEDERATE FLAG NEEDS TO BE RAISED, NOT LOWERED**

**by Chuck Baldwin, July 9, 2015**

Ladies and gentlemen, I submit that what we see happening in the United States today is an apt illustration of why the Confederate flag was raised in the first place. What we see materializing before our very eyes is tyranny: tyranny over the freedom of expression, tyranny over the freedom of association, tyranny over the freedom of

speech, and tyranny over the freedom of conscience.

In 1864, Confederate General Patrick Cleburne warned his fellow southerners of the historical consequences should the South lose their war for independence. He was truly a prophet. He said if the South lost, "It means that the history of this heroic struggle will be written by the enemy. That our youth will be trained by Northern school teachers; will learn from Northern school books their version of the war; will be impressed by all of the influences of History and Education to regard our gallant dead as traitors and our maimed veterans as fit subjects for derision." No truer words were ever spoken. History revisionists flooded America's public schools with Northern propaganda about the people who attempted to secede from the United States, characterizing them as racists, extremists, radicals, hate-mongers, traitors, etc. You know, the same way that people in our federal government and news media attempt to characterize Christians, patriots, war veterans, constitutionalists, et al. today.

Folks, please understand that the only people in 1861 who believed that states did NOT have the right to secede were Abraham Lincoln and his radical Republicans. To say that Southern states did not have the right to secede from the United States is to say that the thirteen colonies did not have the right to secede from Great Britain. One cannot be



right and the other wrong. If one is right, both are right. How can we celebrate our Declaration of Independence in 1776 and then turn around and condemn the Declaration of Independence of the Confederacy in 1861? Talk about hypocrisy!

In fact, southern states were not the only states that talked about secession. After the southern states seceded, the State of Maryland fully intended to join them. In September of 1861, Lincoln sent federal troops to the State capitol and seized the legislature by force in order to prevent them from voting. Federal provost marshals stood guard at the polls and arrested Democrats and anyone else who believed in secession. A special furlough was granted to Maryland troops so they could go home and vote against secession. Judges who tried to inquire into the phony elections were arrested and thrown into military prisons. There is your great “emancipator,” folks.

And before the South seceded, several northern states had also threatened secession. Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island had threatened secession as far back as James Madison’s administration. In addition, the states of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware were threatening secession during the first half of the nineteenth century—long before the southern states even considered such a thing.

People say constantly that Lincoln “saved” the Union. Lincoln didn’t save the Union, he subjugated the Union. There is a huge difference. A union that is not voluntary is not a union. Does a man have a right to force a woman to marry him or to force a woman to stay married to him? In the eyes of God, a union of husband and wife is far superior to a union of states. If God recognizes the right of husbands and wives to separate (and He does), to try and suggest that states do not have the right to lawfully (under Natural and divine right) separate is the most preposterous proposition imaginable.

People say that Lincoln freed the slaves. Lincoln did NOT free a single slave. But what he did do was enslave free men. His so-called Emancipation Proclamation had NO AUTHORITY in the southern states, as they had separated into another country. Imagine a President today signing a proclamation to free folks in say, China or Saudi Arabia. He would be laughed out of Washington. Lincoln had no authority over the Confederate States of America and he knew it.

Do you not find it interesting that Lincoln’s proclamation did NOT free a single slave in the United States, the country in which he DID have authority? That’s right. The Emancipation Proclamation deliberately ignored slavery in the North. Do you not realize that when Lincoln signed his proclamation, there were over 300,000 slaveholders who were fighting in the Union army? Check it out!

One of those northern slaveholders was General (and later US President) Ulysses S. Grant. In fact, he maintained possession of his slaves even after the War of Northern Aggression between the States concluded. Recall that his counterpart, Confederate General Robert E. Lee, freed his slaves BEFORE hostilities between North

and South ever broke out. When asked why he refused to free his slaves, Grant said, “Good help is hard to find these days.”

The institution of slavery did not end until the 13th Amendment was ratified on December 6, 1865. Speaking of the 13th Amendment, did you know that Lincoln authored his own 13th Amendment? It is the only amendment to the Constitution ever proposed by a sitting US President. Here is Lincoln’s proposed amendment: “No amendment shall be made to the Constitution which will authorize or give Congress the power to abolish or interfere within any state with the domestic institutions thereof, including that a person’s held to labor or service by laws of said State.”

You read it right. Lincoln proposed an amendment to the US Constitution PRESERVING the institution of slavery. This proposed amendment was written in March of 1861, a month BEFORE the shots were fired at Fort Sumter, South Carolina. The State of South Carolina was particularly incensed at the tariffs enacted in 1828 and 1832. The tariff of 1828 was disdainfully called, “The Tariff of Abominations” by the State of South Carolina. Accordingly, the South Carolina legislature declared that the tariffs of 1828 and 1832 were “unauthorized by the constitution of the United States.”

Think folks: why would the southern states secede from the Union over slavery when President Abraham Lincoln had offered an amendment to the Constitution guaranteeing the PRESERVATION of slavery? What nonsense! The problem was Lincoln wanted the southern states to pay the Union a 40% tariff on their exports. The South considered this outrageous and refused to pay. By the time hostilities broke out in 1861, the South was paying up to, and perhaps exceeding, 70% of the nation’s taxes. Before the war, the South was very prosperous and productive. And Washington DC, kept raising the taxes and tariffs on them. You know, the way Washington DC keeps raising the taxes on prosperous citizens today.

This is much the same story of the way the colonies refused to pay the demanded tariffs on the British Crown—albeit the tariffs of the Crown were much lower than those demanded by Lincoln (the Crown is the name for the City of London, where the Queen must humble herself and bow to the Lord Mayor, showing she is under authority of that entity). Lincoln’s proposed 13th Amendment was an attempt to entice the South into paying the tariffs by being willing to permanently ensconce the institution of slavery into the Constitution AND THE SOUTH SAID NO!

In addition, the Congressional Record of the United States forever obliterates the notion that the North fought the War of Northern Aggression over slavery. Read it for yourself. This resolution was passed unanimously in the US Congress on July 23, 1861, “The War is waged by the government of the United States not in the spirit of conquest or subjugation, nor for the purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or institutions of the states,

*While They last only*  
**STANDING ON THE PREMISES**  
**A presentation of 38 Biblical Propositions of**  
**Christian-Israel Identity Theology**  
**by Lawrence Blanchard**

*This covers: Does Identity preach a gospel of “hate”? Is it a “cult”?*

*•Did all races come from Adam? • Are all races under the Law of God? • What is the Gospel? • For whom did Jesus Christ die? • Is America in the Bible? • Does salvation in Christ apply to all races? • Who are the only parties to the Biblical Covenants? • Who is the Church comprised of? • Who are the only inhabitants of the New Jerusalem? and much more.*

*Dr. Blanchard hold a M.Div from Denver (Conservative Baptist) Theological Seminary, 1979.*

**#581 @ sug don \$32.55**





but to defend and protect the Union.” What could be clearer? The US Congress declared that the war against the South was NOT an attempt to overthrow or interfere with the “institutions” of the States, but to keep the Union intact (by force). The “institutions” implied most certainly included the institution of slavery.

Hear it loudly and clearly: Lincoln’s war against the South had NOTHING to do with ending slavery—so said the US Congress by unanimous resolution in 1861.

Abraham Lincoln, himself, said it was NEVER his intention to end the institution of slavery. In a letter to Alexander Stevens who later became the Vice President of the Confederacy, Lincoln wrote this: “Do people of the South really entertain fears that a Republican administration would directly, or indirectly, interfere with their slaves, or with them about their slaves? If they do, I wish to assure you, as once a friend, and still, I hope, not an enemy, that there is no cause for such fears. The South would be in no more danger in this respect than it was in the days of Washington.”

Again, what could be clearer? Lincoln himself, said the Southern states had nothing to fear from him in regard to abolishing slavery.

Hear Lincoln again: “If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it.” He also said, “I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so and I have no inclination to do so.”

The idea that the Confederate flag (actually there were five of them) stood for racism, bigotry, hatred, and slavery is just so much hogwash. In fact, if one truly wants to discover who the racist was in 1861, just read the words of Mr. Lincoln. On August 14, 1862, Abraham Lincoln invited a group of black people to the White House. In his address to them, he told them of his plans to colonize them all back to Africa. Listen to what he told these folks: “Why should the people of your race be colonized and where? Why should they leave this country? This is, perhaps the first question for proper consideration. You and we are different races. We have between us a broader difference than exists between almost any other two races. Whether it is right or wrong I need not discuss, but this physical difference is a great disadvantage to us both, as I think. You race suffers very greatly, many of them, by living among us, while ours suffers from your presence. In a word, we suffer on each side. If this is admitted, it affords a reason, at least, why we should be separated. You here are freemen, I suppose? Perhaps you have been long free, or all your lives. Your race is suffering, in my judgment, the greatest wrong inflicted on any people. But even when you cease to be slaves, you are yet far removed from being placed on an equality with the white race. The aspiration of men is to enjoy equality with the best when free, but on this broad continent not a single man of your race is made the equal of a single man of our race.”

Did you hear what Lincoln said? He said that black people would NEVER be equal with white people—even if they all obtained their freedom from slavery. If that isn’t a racist statement, I’ve never heard one.

Lincoln’s statement above is not isolated. In Charleston, Illinois in 1858, Lincoln said in a speech, “I am not, nor have I ever been, in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black

racess which I believe will forever forbid the two races from living together on social or political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white.”

Ladies and gentlemen, in his own words, Abraham Lincoln declared himself to be a white supremacist. Why don’t our history books and news media tell the American people the truth about Lincoln and about the War of Northern Aggression? It’s simple, if people would study the meanings and history of the flag, symbols, and states of the Confederacy and Confederate leaders, they might begin to awaken to the tyrannical policies of Washington DC that precluded southern independence—policies that have only escalated since the defeat of the Confederacy—and they might have a notion to again resist.

By the time Lincoln penned his Emancipation Proclamation, the war had been going on for two years without resolution. In fact, the North was losing the war. Even though the South was outmanned and out-equipped, the genius of the southern generals and fighting acumen of the southern men had put the northern armies on their heels. Many people in the North never saw the legitimacy of Lincoln’s war in the first place, and many of them actively campaigned against it. These people were affectionately called “Copperheads” by people in the South.

I urge you to watch Ron Maxwell’s accurate depiction of those people in the North who favoured the southern cause as depicted in his motion picture, “Copperhead.” (may have this available soon). For that matter, I consider his movie, “Gods and Generals” to be the greatest “Civil War” movie ever made. It is the most accurate and fairest depiction of Confederate General Thomas Jonathan “Stonewall” Jackson ever produced. In my opinion, actor Stephen Lang should have received an Oscar for his performance as General Jackson. But, can you imagine?

That’s another thing: the war fought from 1861 to 1865 was NOT a “civil war.” Civil war suggests two sides fighting for control of the same capital and country. The South didn’t want to take over Washington DC, no more than their forebears wanted to take over London. They wanted to separate from Washington DC, just as America’s Founding Fathers wanted to separate from Great Britain. The proper name for that war are either “The War of Southern Independence,” or “The War of Northern Aggression.”

Had the South wanted to take over Washington DC, they could have done so with the very first battle of the “Civil War.” When Lincoln ordered federal troops to invade Virginia in the First Battle of Manassas (called the “First Battle of Bull Run” by the North), Confederate troops sent the Yankees running for their lives all the way back to Washington. Had the Confederates pursued them, they could have easily taken the city of Washington DC, seized Abraham Lincoln, and perhaps ended the war before it really began. But General Beauregard and the others had no intention of fighting an aggressive war against the North. They merely wanted to defend the South against the aggression of the North.

In order to rally people in the North, Lincoln needed a moral crusade. That’s what his Emancipation Proclamation was all about. This explains why his proclamation was not penned until 1863, after two years of fruitless fighting. He was counting on people in the North to stop resisting his

*and another:*

**IS THE JUDEO-CHRISTIAN GOSPEL  
the BIBLICAL GOSPEL?  
by Lawrence Blanchard**

*Does the ‘Gospel’ of the New Testament  
allow for the inclusion of all races or mix-  
tures of races (i.e. mongrels) as the proper  
subjects and possible recipients of salvation  
by grace through faith in Jesus Christ?  
#583 @ sug don \$23.75*



war against the South if they thought it was some kind of “holy” war. Plus, Lincoln was hoping that his proclamation would incite blacks in the South to insurrect against Southern whites. If thousands of blacks would begin to wage war against their white neighbours, the fighting men of the southern armies would have to leave the battlefields and go home to defend their families. **THIS NEVER HAPPENED.** Not only did blacks not riot against the whites of the south, many black men volunteered to fight alongside their white friends and neighbours in the Confederate army. Unlike the blacks of the North, who were conscripted by Lincoln and forced to fight in segregated units, thousands of blacks in the South fought of their own free will in a fully-integrated southern army. I bet your history books never told you about that.

If one wants to ban a racist flag, one would have to ban the British flag. Ships bearing the Union Jack shipped over 5 million African slaves to countries all over the world, including the British colonies on North America. Other slave ships flew the Dutch flag and the Portuguese flag and the Spanish flag, and yes, the US flag. But not one single slave ship flew the Confederate flag. **NOT ONE!**

By the time Lincoln launched his war against the southern states, slavery was already a dying institution. The entire country, including the South, recognized the moral evil of slavery and wanted to it to end. Only a small fraction of Southerners even owned slaves. The slave trade had ended in 1808, per the US Constitution, and the practice of slavery was quickly dying, too. In another few years, with the advent of agricultural machinery, slavery would have ended peacefully—just like it had in England. It didn’t take a national war and the deaths of over a half million men to end slavery in Great Britain. America’s so-called “Civil War” was absolutely unnecessary. The greed of Lincoln’s radical Republicans in the North, combined with the cold, calloused heart of Lincoln himself is responsible for the tragedy of the “civil war” [of Northern Aggression].

And look at what is happening now: in one instant—after one deranged young man killed nine black people and who ostensibly photo-shopped a picture of himself with a Confederate flag—the entire political and media establishments in the country go on an all-out crusade to remove all semblances of the Confederacy. The speed in which all of this has happened suggests that this was a planned, orchestrated event by the Powers That Be (PTB), and it is a mere coincidence that this took place at the exact time that the US Supreme Court decided to legalise same-sex ‘marriage’? I think not.

The Confederate Battle Flag flies the Saint Andrews cross. Of course, Andrew was the first disciple of Jesus, brother of Simon Peter, and Christian martyr who was crucified on a X-shaped cross at around the age of 90. Andrew is the patron saint of both Russia and Scotland. In the 1800s, up to 75% of people in the South were either Scotch or Scotch-Irish. The Confederate Battle Flag is predicated on the national flag of Scotland. It is a symbol of the Christians faith and heritage of the Celtic race.

Pastor John Weaver rightly observed, “Even the Confederate States motto, “Deovendickia” (The Lord is our

Vindicator), illustrates the sovereignty and the righteousness of God. The Saint Andrews cross is also known as the Greek letter CHIA (KEE)), and has historically been used to represent Jesus Christ. Why do you think people write Merry X-mas, just to give you an illustration? The “X” is the Greek letter CHIA and it has been historically used for Jesus the Christ. Moreover, its importance was understood by educated and uneducated people alike. When an uneducated man, one that could not write, needed to sign his name please tell me what letter he made? An ‘X’, why? Because he was saying I am taking an oath under God. I am recognizing the sovereignty of God, the providence of God and I am pledging my faith. May I tell you, the Confederate Flag is indeed a Christian flag because it has the cross of Saint Andrew, who was a Christian martyr, and the letter ‘X’ has always been used to represent the Christ, and to attack the flag is to deny the sovereignty, the majesty, and the might of the Lord Jesus the Christ and His divine role in our history, culture, and life.”

*received by email.*

[www.confederateamericanpride.com/battle-flag.html](http://www.confederateamericanpride.com/battle-flag.html)

(John Weaver’s message  
***The Truth About the Confederate Flag, CD-J-455 @ \$6.00***)

## **JUST EAT THE MUSTARD**

*by Joel Hilliker*

Believe it or not, it’s the key to your happiness.

On the road and in a hurry, my family flew through a drive-through burger joint for lunch. One minute down the highway, a voice piped up from the back of the van, “I said no mustard. This has mustard. I don’t like

mustard.” (*sound of record scratching*)

Maybe that seems like a perfectly reasonable statement to you. But to he who had purchased this sandwich and provided it to his offspring in order to sustain her life for a few more hours—on a trip he was making solely for her benefit—it sounded like royal griping from Princess Persnickety.

I recalled that incident, and how it got under my skin, recently when I was reading the book of Numbers. This is the biblical book about the Israelites’ march from Mount Sinai, where they received God’s Law, toward the paradise of the Promised Land. They had just started to move out from the mountain—just a mile or two down the highway, so to speak—when things went bad.

“*And when the people complained,*” Numbers 11:1 says, “*it displeased the Lord: and the Lord heard it; and his anger was kindled...*”

It doesn’t even say specifically what they complained about. It doesn’t mention a single thing actually being wrong. The margin translates this verse, “*And the people were as it were complainers.*” That’s just what they were: **COMPLAINERS.**

This wasn’t the first time since being miraculously set free from soul-crushing slavery that the Israelites had grumbled, murmured and moaned (e.g. Exodus 15:23-24, 16:2-3, 17:2-3). This was a *habit* with these picky people. They didn’t like what the Almighty God was providing for them. And what did God think? His reaction was at least somewhat similar to mine: He heard that voice from “the back of the van,” it displeased Him, and He got angry!

Do you complain? Maybe you do without even realiz-

**Complete your set:**  
**SOUNDING FORTH THE TRUMPET**  
**by Peter Marshall and David Manuel**  
**authors of the previous 2 books in this series:**  
***The Light and the Glory, and***  
***From Sea to Shining Sea.***  
***This brings to life one of the most crucial epochs***  
***of the nation’s history, the Civil War, the frenzy***  
***of the Gold Rush, the Mexican War, the skirmishes***  
***of Kansas, the emergence of Abraham***  
***Lincoln. While exposing a dark chapter in our***  
***history it also explores the young nation’s drive***  
***to freedom and independence. 1837 - 1860.***  
**# 833 @ sug don \$ 39.30**



ing it. A man names Will Bowen, who wrote a book called *A Complaint Free World*, said this: "Complaining is like bad breath: You notice it when it comes out of somebody else's mouth, but not your own."

You might not notice—but guess what: *God does*. He hears when we complain—and it angers Him. Why would our belly-aching upset God so much? Because He wants us to be content with what we have. And He wants us to be grateful for what He gives us. He knows that if we don't know how to be content, we can never be happy (by Tithing, we can show that we appreciate and are thankful for what God gives us).

Discontentment—whether it's over a trek through the wilderness or a mustardy burger—is really a lack of perspective. Read Matthew 6:25-34. You could look at what Jesus Christ is saying in these terms: *Don't get worked up over picky things. If you are disgruntled about your food or your clothing, your perspective is off. Be thankful you have a LIFE to sustain with food and drink! Be thankful you have a BODY to clothe! And just know that God will look after you.*

In the Western world, people feel entitled to so much. Americans 50 years ago had only *one third* the wealth of Americans today. Living standards in Britain have also tripled in the last half-century. The average American home is more than 2,400 square feet (222m<sup>2</sup>)—whereas in 1950, it was about 960 square feet (89m<sup>2</sup>). Since 1950, Americans have consumed more resources than *every-one who ever lived before them combined!*

So why do so many of us feel like what we have isn't good enough? God is so generous with us. In fact, every truly good thing in our lives ultimately comes from Him (James 1:17). For the Israelites in the wilderness, He actually rained bread from the skies to sustain them! That is a spectacular miracle. But what did the Israelites say? Go back to Numbers 11, "*And the children of Israel also wept again, and said, Who shall give us flesh to eat? We remember the fish, which we did eat in Egypt freely; the cucumbers, and the melons, and the leeks, and the onions, and the garlick: But now our soul is dried away: there is nothing at all, beside this manna, before our eyes*" (verses 4-6).

Is that not crazy? *There's nothing to eat—except for this MIRACULOUS NOURISHMENT DESCENDING DIRECTLY OUT OF HEAVEN FROM THE OMNIPOTENT CREATOR OF THE UNIVERSE. And I don't like manna!*

That perspective is terribly distorted. And don't think you or I could never be so stupid. We *all* can tend to be discontented and ungrateful—even to the point of forgetting the miracles of God. When you lose sight of all that God provides, you become crabby and dissatisfied. Instead, remember God's blessings, and you'll be happy and content. Rather than complaining, God wants you "Giving thanks *always* for *all things*" (Ephesians 5:20). "Keep your life free from love of money, and *be content with what you have*; for He has said, 'I will never fail you nor forsake you'" (Hebrews 13:5); RSV.

Be like the apostle Paul, who said, "I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content" (Philippians 4:11). Even when there's mustard on the burger.

Courtesy The Philadelphia Trumpet, Box 3700 Edmond OK 73083.

## CHRISTIAN ECONOMICS — THE HIDDEN BAAL

by Matthew Luckey

**Exodus 32:7-8, "And the LORD said unto Moses, Go, get thee down; for thy people, which thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt, have corrupted themselves: They have turned aside quickly out of the way which I commanded them: they have made them a molten calf, and have worshipped it, and have sacrificed thereunto, and said, these be thy gods, O Israel, which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.**

I do not pin my hopes on the gold standard as, apparently, so many on the Right. The folks tired of waiting for Moses to return did that. Except in those days they called the gold standard the Golden Calf. This whole story has much more significance for today than most Bible students realize. The Exodus Israelites weren't just dancing around a Gold Calf in some pointless and irrational frenzy. The Golden Calf represented to them the highest expression of

humanist rationality, fallen man's self-salvation through his innate faculty of reason. The Golden Calf stood for the basis of social organisation and social substitution for God's Holy Law: the gold standard for social existence instead of the God Standard. It represented what man does when he doesn't follow God. The Golden Calf was the foundation of social interaction, social circulation, the medium of social life, and the basis of social intercourse (commerce and trade). The Golden Calf was the founding of the world's first universalist financial

system, and its devotees were the world's first fiscal conservatives. Why else do you think they placed so much enthusiasm and confidence in this idol? (Personally, I think this is something they learned while in Egypt, and it gave them a sense of security back to Egypt - remember they wanted to return. CIM) The conflict is between God's independent authority expressed by His Law-order and mankind's independent authority personified by the Gold Calf standard.

The irreducible biblical and natural axiom of man's economic life is the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal." This command expresses the perfect economic philosophy for man, because it issues from the Creator who knows best about His Creation. Nothing else is required; it is sufficient. The only problem is in man's refusal to *follow* the command. Someone in revolt against God is like a slippery fish. A simple law has difficulty getting hold of him. He finds some way to slither out of its grasp. "Thou shalt not steal" means no graft. It means one is prohibited from parasitically attaching themselves to another's labor. It requires you to earn *yourself* what you possess, with the exceptions of inheritance, gifts and volitional charity. For the sake of the slippery fish I'd better clarify what "earning" means. Earning is the relation you have with what you possess: these possessions are earned when they do not issue from anyone else's sweat. In other words, when you invent a swindle whereby you withhold (legally or otherwise) the value another has directly earned, said *withholding* is not the same as earning, even if you *call* it "earning," or "creative destruction" or "job creation" or "taxes" or "profit." This swindle is plain old theft, which does not become any less theft because it is more complicated.

So forget the gold standard. We need the God stan-

Videos you may have missed:

Where is

**BIBLICAL FEMININITY?**

Cultivating Sturdy Virtue in today's Daughters.

Anna Sofia & Elizabeth Botkin

*in this powerful message seek to explain what BF is and what it is not. True femininity they maintain, is not based on tradition, stereotypes, or romantic images from the past - if a lady's heart is not devoted to putting Biblical priorities first, she is not practising femininity as God designed it.*

CI-678 @ sug don \$8



dard, which is the EARNING STANDARD. Biblically speaking, the EARNING STANDARD must be the lynchpin of the economy. The EARNING STANDARD is simply another way of saying, “Thou shalt not steal.” It is the only economic standard that accords with the biblical prohibition against graft. And the problem will not be in adding more supplements or qualifications to this principle; it will be in enforcing it consistently and vigilantly, and also in keeping social life simple, decentralised, and small enough so that the Law of God can be enforced.

The real gold is not the yellow metal. The real gold is labor, the actual earning and creating of value. It is the only immediate and natural economic determination of value. It comes before the yellow metal is in hand, and thereby gives the yellow metal its value. All so-called “natural” standards for humanist economy are, in fact products of human invention—require that all participants in the economy AGREE first that something is the natural standard. Thus, they are values that issue from man’s innate faculty of sanctioning by permission rather than issuing from God’s sovereign command. All non-God standards of value that function as the lynchpin for social organization represent fallen man usurping the sovereign office reserved for God. Only earning does not require the approval of men for it to be the natural standard of the economy; rather, each man must earn the approval of this economy by hard work or else he will own nothing. The EARNING STANDARD points to God as sovereign Creator while every other conventional standard affirms fallen man as sovereign authority. Every man may earn, but not every man is able to hoard gold, so earning is the natural God-created equalizer between men. Earning requires each man to demonstrate his character before he may possess. If he is of low character—shiftless, idle, and dishonest—then he will not possess. The EARNING STANDARD, therefore requires each man to follow the rest of God’s Law if he wants to be successful. He cannot escape from work by hiding behind his family’s conspicuous wealth or by obtaining through nepotism a soft and insulated government or university appointment. In such a Godly economy the natural moral aristocracy will rise to the top while the natural *morally challenged* will sink to the bottom. A natural equalizer is also a natural sifter.

I’ve noticed a lot of conservatives attack the non-gold standard of our national economy as a *de facto* form of confiscating wealth: exchange reserve notes for gold and silver, seize said silver and gold, and then destroy the value of the currency through inflation. Quite an impressive swindle, right? Required a lot of forethought, planning and remarkable patience. You can bet there’s a gang of Jews hiding behind it all. I don’t disagree with this criticism of the economy at all; I just disagree with what they offer as the solution to take the place of this swindle; primarily because it is no less the same kind of swindle. The economy standard that replaced the biblical EARNING STANDARD is also a tactic of confiscation of wealth. Its purpose was to steal the rightful wealth of the true earner by destroying the value of his labor and replacing it with the value of the Golden Calf. All of these things are chapters in an ages-long occult war hidden from the eyes of the ordinary, hard-working, law-abiding, Christian Israelite to steal the world from God’s sovereign jurisdiction. We perish for lack of knowledge.

-----\*\*-----\*\*-----

## MIGHT MAKES RIGHT

by Matthew Luckey

Everyone’s heard the old phrase, “**Might Makes Right.**” And everyone already knows that “**Might Makes Right**” is a bad thing. It evokes images of Bluto beating-up Popeye before the latter eats his spinach, or of marching storm troops brushing skulls beneath their boots. Historically, we in the West are issued an alternative from which we are expected to choose the already decided-upon correct answer: Either (1) “**Might Makes Right**” or else (2) “**Right Free from Might.**” The first alternative expresses the so-called “law of the jungle,” a condition when people live in a state of nature without the laws of civilization to protect them from Bluto. “**Right Free from Might,**” on the other hand, expresses the spirit of secular governing documents like the US Constitution, which define civilization as the prohibition of substantive moral law (“Separation of Church and state”) buttressed by weak and regularly unenforced secular “law” (which are really not laws at all but administrative “rules of thumb”). The Law of God, therefore, is identified with the law of the jungle, while civilization is understood as the project of leaving the jungle—and thereby Biblical Law—behind. God’s Law is not criminalized, mind you, it’s just barred from governance and made socially irrelevant. Both of these—the legislating of the secular manager’s “rules of thumb” and the official banning of Biblical Law from office—stand as the two ideological pillars upon which

modern secular societies rest. But they are also the philosophies of abdication (official terms of surrender, but to what?), of abdicating responsibility to enforce morality, protect the poor and powerless, and to be a terror to evildoers.

I refer to secular “law” as “rules of thumb” as opposed to genuine Law, because the existence of Law, properly speaking, is an implicit assertion that Law is the sovereign authority. That is, Law is *The Decider*, and public officials are merely ministers tasked with implementing the Law’s decisions. Under secular “law,” however, sovereignty rests with the secular manager; which means he deploys “law” as “rules of thumb” if and when he finds them efficient and “beneficial” for the administration of the social structure, and not consistently. He and his interests as social manager are *The Decider*, and “law” is but a tool for advancing this *Decider*, and therefore is not Law at all.

We modern citizens of the secular state have long been conditioned to assume that “**Might Makes Right**” is an evil sentiment, and therefore, dutifully point to The Second Box: **Right should be right without might, or rather, right can only be right if it is without might.** But, what the thought-engineers of the modern social machine leave out of their pleasant, air-conditioned, secular Sunday-school framing of the issue is that might is not something over which we have a choice. Might—violence—is the *de facto* condition of existence in this world. If we refrain from enforcing morality by might, this does not mean, then, that there will be no might. It simply means that the field of action has been forfeited to the wicked to freely enforce their might on everyone else. Violence is unavoidable, not because the righteous want it, but because the wicked insist on a violent response and will tolerate no other.

The philosophy expressed in the canned choice between **Might** or **Right** is one of abdication, of forfeiture—and surrender to evil; what I like to call the theology of

**Restricted Old Historic LOAN Video:**  
**HIDDEN CRIMES - MA-15+**  
*The first film ever to prove that we are all victims of the fraud of animal research. See what the media won't show you. Contains explicit scenes of animal vivisection. Restrictions apply to persons under 15.*  
**CI-235 @ sug LOAN don \$7**



“Just let happen, and punish any who complain.” Such a philosophy cannot restrain might, it fosters even sanctions might, the wrong kind of might. Evildoers love this kind of philosophy because it liberates them to prey on their victims. God’s Aryan-Israel People must accept the fact that violence is unavoidable, for we are responsible for enforcing the Law of God.

So, with the abdication of might by our secular principality—of banning God’s Law and replacing it with procedural “rules of thumb” weakened further by the public narcotic called “negative rights”—this principality has disabled itself from fulfilling its most basic duty to protect the lawful and punish the wicked. As any unfortunate child of the public school playground during recess knows all too well, rules not backed by might and the vigilant will to exercise this might are no rules at all. Down deep, even our dear leaders understand this principle of the public school playground, for they depend on the fact the law will not be enforced to get away with their own public sins. An undeniable symmetry exists between the official and the street thug, and the system that enables them.

For public authority to renounce moral might is, defacto, to sanction criminal might. A law of omission is not a law. It fosters the commission of crime. Laws (including administrative “rules-of-thumb”) are unenforced in two senses. First, substantive moral Law (God’s Law) is officially barred from public office by being relegated exclusively to the non-political private sphere, thereby man makes the Author of the Law an exile in His own creation. Secondly, secular “rules- of-thumb” do not function as laws but as instrumental means for maintaining social stability and efficiency. They are never enforced as “Law” and only irregularly and arbitrarily applied as stabilizers for social containment. Secular law functions primarily as symbols and points of public intelligibility for exploitation by politicians and special interests. They are implemented by politicians and special interests. They are implemented just enough to give the public the illusion that society has not yet collapsed into race-war and civil anarchy. The vast majority of secular laws—such as prohibitions against jay-walking and dope-smoking—are regularly violated by the same officials who administer these secular laws, let alone enforced on others. So, the claim to legitimacy made by secular government’s “rule-without-God”—namely, that it has rescued mankind from the savage state of the jungle—is a fraud. Secular government has fostered and empowered savage lawless might throughout society. Civilization is not a contracting out of the law of the jungle, as professional apologists for secular orthodoxy lie to us. It is the law of the jungle’s full ascent to hegemony over society. We live in a system of rationalized and formalized savage lawlessness, a system of maximal and sustainable evil.

### ADAM DE WITT ANSWERS:

Question: I have a little problem with John 13:36 and John 14:2-3. We know that God’s Kingdom will be here on earth, and Jesus will be King of kings. When I tell this to believers they quote John 13:36 and 14:2-3. “Jesus said to Peter, ‘Where I am going you cannot follow, but you will follow later.’ and ‘in my Father’s house are many mansions. I will go and prepare a place for you.’ This indicates that the Lord is going away from the earth - to heaven and prepare a place for the believers. That’s why Christians believe that as soon as they die they will go to heaven.”

A: Firstly, it does in no way indicate that someone is

going off to heaven, that is if heaven is that spot in and on the clouds. (I’ve done a lot of flying and still not seen it on the clouds yet). Christians or better said Judeo-Christians, believe that when they die they go to heaven. Well Christians do not believe that. A Christian is one who is not filled with the mind-set tainted with the leaven of the Pharisees, only a handful of folk. The throngs are tainted with that leaven and this has been the case as from the time of the writings of Paul. But that is another subject. Nevertheless, it is a point that needed to be made, as it is that tradition that wrecks the Word of God, and for those seeking truth, it is hard to break free from that tradition; or aspects of it as it has shaped Western civilization. That tradition has tainted everyone because even those seeking truth will use a verse here and there and then think about that one verse and ponder the meaning thereof. Big mistake! You cannot get meaning from one verse as every verse is simply a sentence or two lifted out of an account and subject on an issue. So if one needs to understand the 2 verses in question, one needs to read the whole chapter or even several chapters to get the gist of the verse.

Looking then at the context of the subject matter we see that Jesus is talking about the cross, not heaven. I frankly do not understand why anyone can even assume it’s about heaven as that word is not even used. Read on and one will see He is talking about death on the cross, that is where Jesus was going and the rest were not going there that day with him. Indeed, Jesus then says in vs 38 to Peter about where He is going, “Wilt thou lay down thy life for my sake?” Jesus was going somewhere to lay down His life, for our sake. That is the whole point of the whole offering system. Jesus was saying that no one needed to redeem Him as He was not a sinner. He had to lay down His life for sinners; not sinners for the One who could not sin! So the apostles could not go there, only Jesus could

go there. Furthermore, Jesus says that AFTER that event they WILL go where He goes (Ch. 14:2-3) This is because after the cross He then will be risen, and the apostles will follow Him again, and they did..... on earth.

This was the Kingdom on a Pentecost level, the Church Age which began when holy ghost — which was once on and in temples made by hands — was then in and on temples made the upper room on the feast of Weeks/Pentecost of 33 AD. The Kingdom had on that day been restored to the FOLK of Israel, and taken away from the State Church of Judea which had taken it by violence from the FOLK of Israel some 150 years earlier. That is what Jesus promised, and did.

The Kingdom is for Israelites and graftable kin only. The cornerstones are the apostles of the New Jerusalem, and the gates are of the tribes. Each tribe is a nation or House. This then brings us to the next ask of what does it mean, in my Father’s house there are many mansions where a place is made ready for them.

One will notice that ‘mansion’ is used as well as the word ‘house.’ These are poor translations from the Greek words used. So if I was to translate the words better we would read, “In My Father’s abode there are many houses.” That then means, in My Father’s kingdom there are all the houses (clans) of Israel which will dwell there. Indeed in verse 6 Jesus says that the only way into this abode is through Him.

Of course, the Body of Anointed are the Overcomers,

**Still available:**  
**We still have quantities of cassette tapes available to clear quickly @ 10 tapes for \$10 posted - be quick they will have to go up with postage rises.**

-----  
**Direct deposit available to: C.I.M.**  
**Bendigo Bank**  
**BSB 633-000**  
**Account # 128022837**  
**or PayPal to: hr\_cim@bigpond.com**



the 144,000. Holy ghost came upon Jesus, He being the head at that point, thereafter needed to find His body; and holy ghost (hallowed thinking - or mind-set of separation) was seeded in a certain number of Israelites to form His body. So they are the first into that abode, New Jerusalem. When they are all ready, then the bride still needs wooing as so far she has been the whore, this is the larger class of Israelites and graftable kin who are of the churches and of the “-isms.”

So it's about the kingdom of God, and the transition from Passover level to Pentecost level.

I hope this has helped. .... Adam de Witt

-----  
***“The European peoples have only one choice if they want to save their existence: to see what they have in common and to stand up for it.”***

It may surprise you, but this observation is from Adolph Hitler, found in a book translated from German, *SS Ideology, 1944*. The truth he spoke is obvious to those who have eyes to see, but those intent on being politically correct no longer have that ability to reason/think and see.

The countries of Europe have long had a history of *always* being at war with one another, unable to be at peace for very long.

And isn't this good advice too, for real Christians who are so hopelessly divided/neutralized by so many denominations/doctrines/squabbles/strife today?! Whew!

Why can't we **UNITE** around our love for and obedience to the Lord Jesus the Christ, and support Him and His ways, instead of man and man's self-centered ways that have always gotten us, His people, into so much trouble?

Shouldn't we strive to: **Be Likeminded - One to Another?! Having the Mind of the Christ?**

How can *unity* be found in diversity, which current politically correct propaganda pushes on us?!

\*---\*

*from late Pastor FWC Nesor of South Africa:*

I believe the immediate future will be tremendously challenging for all of us. We have to remain close to the Lord and to one another, His cherished children.

If a jackal wants to catch a sheep he first makes a lot of noise, a diversion to send the herd flying ... and the one who leaves the herd will be caught.

**Let us stick together, encourage and pray for one another, let us as a remnant, stay intact until Jesus comes.**

He will not take longer than required. Hallelujah!

\*---\*

## **THE PRESENT REIGN OF JESUS THE CHRIST**

*by Robert Caringola*

(from his book by that title)

***“I John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation (in the 1st century), and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus the Christ, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus the Christ.”*** Rev. 1:9.

Please notice where John is, in the Kingdom. He claimed to be *in the kingdom ... of Jesus Christ*. It amazes me how so many lack the revelation of the present Kingdom. We again can thank dispensationalism for that. They want you to believe that the Kingdom, and its authority, is postponed until after the second coming of the Christ. But the Bible teaches that Jesus established the Kingdom at His first coming. He told the Jews: ***“The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof”*** (Matt. 21:43).

The logical question is “Who did He give it to?” Jesus said: ***“Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good***

***pleasure to give you the kingdom”*** (Luke 12:32). This Kingdom belongs to those who have received Jesus, not to those who reject Him.

Peter explained ***But ye*** (Christian Israelites) ***are a chosen generation*** (race), ***a royal priesthood, a holy nation .. which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God*** (1 Pet. 2:9,10)

And Jesus made it clear to His disciples what they were inheriting. He said ***I appoint unto you a kingdom, as My Father hath appointed unto Me*** (Luke 22:29).

\*---\*

## **OUR REAL ENEMIES**

You and I might just be on the same page when it comes to many others in the ‘movement’ dwelling on negative stories and what ‘they’ are doing to ‘us.’

Jesus didn't waste His time, nor did the Apostles, telling folks how bad the Pharisees were and how they schemed day and night to bring people into more bondage. However, He did confront them directly face-to-face and put them in their place real quick

Paul in Acts 28, at the very end was preaching the Kingdom of God ... and some believed .... and some didn't.

I think we need to do that too. To always be on about the Jews is to elevate them to some all-powerful Satan that can't be obstructed by anything we do. Nonsense . . . Let's get on talking about the Law that will set us free.

Our enemies are those of our own household. People are as dumb as bricks. These are the ones that need awakening. How we can do that is the million dollar question.

I do remain optimistic because I know we have the answers to the many problems and when our/His people are driven so far into the dirt, ... one day they may listen to the real solution. .... *Jay Nauss.*

\*---\*

## **IF PEOPLE ARE NOT WILLING TO ACCEPT TRUTH;**

Nothing is more galling than to fight with facts and arguments against an adversary in the belief that one is dealing with his understanding, When in reality one is dealing with the will, which obdurately closes its mind to the truth.

One must understand that reason applied against the will, is like seed sown or bare rock, like light arrows against armor, like the stormwind against a beam of light.

..... *Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860)*

Courtesy Hear Ye, Hear Ye, GPO Lead Hill AR 72644

-----  
Well, here we are again, returned from our trip to Sydney and stopping off at Gatton, Inverell, and North Rothbury, and Glen Aplin on the way back. The only problem we encountered was a shredded tyre on our trailer when we were just 100 kilometers from home, after travelling almost 5,500 kilometers all up. We thank God for His travelling mercies and protection, watching over us and bringing us safely home again.

Then we had family come and stay for a week, which was very helpful (it should happen more often!). But now we have much to catch up on.

Looking forward to getting lots of mail from you again in the near future. Our thanks for those who continue to write and order material, and also thanks for your clippings. We do look forward to all the mail. May God bless you for your faithfulness, and put His blessing of protection on you in these trying times. In America there is a push for removing all books (Fahrenheit 351) with Christian content, or written by Christian authors, or published by Christian publishers from public (school) libraries. May God help us all,

