



# 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 swore to *our* father Abraham, That he would grant unto *us*, that *we* being delivered out of the hand of *our* enemies might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of *our* lives." Luke 1:68-75; the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic-Germanic-Scandinavian people are *ISRAEL!*

#353

## Covenant Messenger

October AD2015

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

### THE BIBLE, RACE AND CULTURE, PT 3.

by Arnold Kennedy

#### God's Severance of Israel from the Other Races - Cont.

"For I the Lord am holy, and have severed you from other people that you should be mine." Lev. 20:26.

When God severed Israel from the other races, there is no indication that this severance was for any limited period, in fact the opposite is shown, as shall be seen as we go along. This separation is a racial separation, or we might say that it is racism on the part of God. Before saying anything about the identity of Israel today, we must first establish what both Testaments say exclusively about "Israel" as a race.

"For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them ... and what nation is there so great that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as this law which I set before you this day." Deut 4:7-8.

This is the first verse we will look into which establishes the fact that the statutes [= "*choq*"] and the Judgments [= "*mishpat*"], connects with Israel in a way that does not apply to other races. [NOTE: This does not mention other parts of the total law, i.e. "*Torah*," "*Mishmereth*," "*Chuqqah*," "*Mitsveh*" and "*Tseqdaqah*" which are translated in a mixed up way as ordinances, charges, commands, statutes, and justice, all of the latter being first mentioned in connection with Abraham].

Moses, speaking to Israel alone, declares in verse 13 that this does involve The Ten Commandments.

"...and He declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments and He wrote them upon two tables of stone." Deut. 4:13.

The Old Covenant was made with Israel as a nation alone, even if there was a "*mixed multitude*" there with Israel at that time. The issue here is not the Law as a total, but the covenant made to the congregation of Israel [*cahal*], in isolation from the mixed multitude journeying with them [*edah*].

"And because He loved thy fathers, therefore He chose **THEIR SEED** after them." Deut. 4:37.

This is a genetic statement! This reference to the seed of Israel continues through the New Testament. It is sometimes presented in connection with the words "*called*," "*chosen*," "*inheritance*," "*predestined*," "*redeemed*," "*elect*," "*foreknown*" and "*purchased possession*." When we look at this, we have to ask if this "seed" of the Fathers is genetic [physical] or spiritual. If it is claimed that this is now a spiritual seed, we have to be able to say when this changed [if we can]. "*Thy Fathers*" in this verse, as in so

many other verses refers to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and not just Abraham as those who like to spiritualize the "*seed of Abraham*" only want to insist. We are told three times "**In Isaac shall thy seed be called**" {Gen. 21:12, Rom. 9:7, and Heb. 11:18}, and so how can any other race be included?

"For you are a holy [separate] people unto the Lord your God. The Lord your God has chosen you to be as special people unto himself, above all the people that are upon the face of all the earth." Deut. 7:6.

This is one of the early statements about the unique exclusive "special people" place of Israel racially among the races on the whole earth. We have to ask if this continues into the New Testament; if not, whatever happened to this special race? Paul records about the Potter who made differing vessels according to His purposes-[Rom. 9:20-23], and asks who do we think we are to argue with God. Christians still want to argue and find it hard to believe what the New Testament says about "vessels of wrath" which are "*fitted to destruction*" and "vessels of mercy" which are "*afore prepared for mercy*." God did make a decision and a choice upon a racial basis.

If Israel as a seed was to disappear as a race from the Bible, prophecy would forecast this. Paul asks, "*Has God cast away His people? God forbid*" -[Rom. 11:1]. The separation of all Israel into two houses still existed of whom "part" were blinded [v.7] but Israel as a whole "*hath not obtained*..." The fact of this separation is not commonly

#### IN THIS ISSUE:

The Bible, Race, and Culture, pt 3, .....	1
Warning for Christian Religious Leaders, .....	6
Jail for US Clerk Opposed to Gay Marriage, .....	8
Transgenders Won't "Live a Lie" - but they, .....	8
The Legacy of Government Education, .....	9
The Kingdom of God, .....	12
Adam de Witt Answers, .....	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.

taught. Isaiah 11 shows the timing factors and the “envy” between the House of Israel and the House of Judah remaining until the time stated.

“For the Lord’s portion is **HIS PEOPLE, JACOB** is the lot of His inheritance.” Deut. 32:9.

“His People” are not every race on earth, as we can see. “People” here is ‘am, which is used in the sense of a tribe among other peoples. There is not one clear statement anywhere in scripture to say that any other race than Jacob [Israel] genetically is God’s inheritance. “Jacob” is mentioned 24 times in the New Testament and so there is no change to this racial identity.

“Happy art thou, O ISRAEL who is like unto thee O people saved by the Lord”! Deut. 33:29.

The apostle Paul concludes his discourse about two parties by saying, “And so shall all Israel be saved.” [Rom. 11:6]. The two parties concerned are the House of Judah and the House of Israel, not Israelites and non-Israelites. The “middle wall of partition” was between these two. In truth then, is there any other race “like unto thee”? Does God in fact make a difference between races? He certainly does in all these scriptures. Has our unchanging God changed?

“Lo, this people shall dwell ALONE, and SHALL NOT BE RECKONED AMONG THE NATIONS.” Num. 23:9.

This again presents the separation racially of Israel from the other nations. In the New Testament the call is still to “Come ye out from among them and be ye separate...” (2 Cor. 6:17). “Touch” or *haptomai* here is a word used of carnal intercourse with a woman, like it or not - [confirm this in 1 Cor. 7:1-3]. The “them” in this verse are “unclean” people [not ‘things’ which is inserted as an added word] that are not to be “touched.” “Unclean” or *akathartos*

shows that there is a difference between ‘clean’ and ‘unclean’ people, with the clean not to ‘touch’ the unclean. The “yoke” in 2 Cor. 6:14 is with *heterozugeo* which means a *different sort* (Vine), or *one who is not an equal* [Thayer]. God also made clean and unclean animals and fish; each were born that way. There is frequent reference to show that God’s judgment is upon those of Israel who transgress by having this common carnal intercourse with other races. This shows up also through the New Testament. Jesus says in the Revelation that He holds it against the churches which hold the Doctrine of Balaam - [Rev. 2:14]. From the 60 mentions of Balaam, this doctrine is quite clear. Because almost all denominations hold the doctrine of Balaam without knowing it, we can understand just why it is never taught. Probably few know what this doctrine is, but all should if Jesus holds it against them! 2 Peter 2:15 indicates that people with this doctrine have gone astray. Jude v11 calls holding it an error.

New Testament “fornication” has not changed from what Old Testament fornication was, even if we like to try to say that *Porneuo* has no racial connection today. In 1 Cor 10:8 we are told that all that is mentioned in this passage, are for examples to us. When we read what one example is, we find, “Neither let us commit fornication as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand.” Look back to the Old Testament and find that what caused three and twenty thousand to die was Israelites having sex with non-Israelites - [Num. 25:1] Moses even demanded that all Israelites who did this should be slain because of the idolatry that followed. King Solomon got caught this way and it also led to idolatry. We read of

plagues in Israel because of this - [Numbers 25:6-8]. Ezra 10 tells that separation is demanded [not divorce, as it was not a lawful marriage], where “strange” or “*nokriy*” non-Israelite wives are concerned. See Nehemiah 13:23-27. These things are written for our admonition we are told in 1 Cor. 10:11, but because of the popular but wrong doctrine to the contrary, this necessity for admonition is not accepted today. Jezebel [also a foreign wife] is permitted in the churches today even if Jesus says He holds it against the churches - [Rev.2:20]. What this means is that the New Testament doctrine about racial intermarriage is the same as that in the Old Testament. So, when did the doctrine change to the belief that God no longer requires Israel to dwell alone, not to intermarry with other races, and be separate from the other races?

“And what ONE NATION in the earth is like thy people, even like ISRAEL, whom God went to redeem a PEOPLE, and to make Himself a name.” 2 Samuel 7:23.

Note the singular emphasis here, and that redemption refers to this singular people alone. It is Israel alone who are stated to be the people God went to redeem. Galatians 4:5 and Hebrews 9:15 confirm that the mediation of the New Covenant was for the redemption of the transgressions

that were under the First Testament [Israel only]. See also Titus 2:14 and Luke 2:38. To redeem something means that it must have belonged once before, and so redemption can only apply to Israel.

“For He established a testimony in Jacob, and a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers.” Psalm 78:5.

This is another scripture confirming many along this line. But where can we find any scriptures giving even a suggestion that the Law and Covenants were given to other races? “Our fathers” and “the fathers” are common New Testa-

ment expressions. So, all these New Testament people being addressed must also be Israelites!

“He hath showed His word unto JACOB, and His statutes unto ISRAEL, HE HATH NOT DEALT SO WITH ANY NATION, and as for His judgments, they [the other nations] have not known them.” Psalm 147:19-20.

This verse is both limiting and specific and relates exclusively to Israel as a race. Churches in our land that believe this are very few. The “word” here is “*dabar*,” or the spoken word in the sense of a specific direction, charge, instruction or covenant. “Statutes” here is “*choq*” and Judgments is again “*mishpat*,” as pointed out in the Deut 4:7 reference above. This is a very clear statement, and note this spoken word is NOT given to other races! This is not a popular concept or popular teaching, but it is confirmed in both Testaments. Acts 10:36 says, “The Word which God sent to the Children of Israel” so we can see that the Apostle Paul agrees about this. But if God declares “He hath not dealt so with any nation” we dare not question this, even if denominations ignore it. Israel is unique! The judgments are “*mishpat*” ... or God’s verdict or decree. THE WHOLE BIBLE IS ABOUT ISRAEL AND ISRAELITES. Non-Israel races are mentioned in the Bible two ways, firstly as they impinge upon Israel and secondly in connection to world empires. It is not difficult to conclude that the Bible is a book primarily about God’s purposes for Israel [as a people] because Jehovah is consistently declared to be the God of this one people. Because we do not find this expression of purpose for other races, we cannot presume anything that is not said about them.

**BIBLE STATISTICS CONFIRM THE STATUS OF**

New Video

## THE TRUTH ABOUT THE SODOMITES

Pastor Steven Anderson

*Is a dynamic and hard-hitting preacher who is not afraid of revealing the truth about homosexuality. He says if you believe that sodomy is a normal lifestyle you have been brain-washed.*

DVD#CI-1002 @ sug don \$8



## ISRAEL

Israel as "Yisra'el"	2,514 times [Old Testament]
Israel as "Israel"	70 times [New Testament]
Jacob [KJV]	358 times [24 in the N.T.]
Judah	813 times
Ephraim	172 times
Manasseh	143 times
Hebrews	21 times
Lord God of Israel	110 times
God of Israel	90 times
Holy One of Israel	31 times
Lord God of the Hebrews	5 times
Mighty God of Jacob	4 times
Hope of Israel	2 times
Congregation of Israel	160 times [as "qahal"]
Congregation of Israel	173 times [as "edah"]
Assembly of Israel	21 times [as "atsarah"]
"Ekklesia	116 times in the N.T.
Tribes ["Shebet"] of Israel	190 times [Old Testament]
Tribes [Phule] of Israel	31 times [New Testament]
People of Israel	19 times [KJV]
My people	231 times

Then we find expressions like, **Israel's God, the Light of, the Rock of, the Redeemer of, the Stone of, the Shepherd of, the Portion of, the God of**; all of which refer expressly to Israel. In the KJV we find the words:

"Of Israel" occur 1,692 times!

"to Israel" occur 23 times!

"for Israel" 24 times!

Then there are expressions like "The God of your fathers" and "fathers of Israel" ["fathers" is mentioned 549 times including 56 through the New Testament], so there is no doubt about the sole race concerned because 'pater' is a genetic term in context.

There is the intimate word "Jeshurun" for Israel. There are at least 5,000 direct references isolating Israel as a people. This personal GOD OF ISRAEL, Jehovah, ["Yehovah"] is mentioned 6,528 times by this name and 21 times as "Yahh." From here on in this paper, we will look very briefly at a number of topics that connect in a doctrinal way with what has been pointed out thus far. Each paragraph below is a portion, or summary, of chapters from the author's book "The Exclusiveness of Israel" (#714 @ \$23.95).

### WHO ARE GATHERED TO GOD IN THE END?

Jer. 50:6 says, "My people hath been lost sheep." It was the "sheep" that Jesus says He came to give His life for - [John 10:15]. Jesus said, "I lay down my life for the sheep." He goes on to say these sheep are from both the Judean and the Dispersion folds. Sheep are born sheep. Goats are conceived as goats according to God's Law "after their kind." Tares come from tare seed. The tares are to be burned and the goats are to be separated. They cannot ever change how they were created. Paraphrasing Paul's contention, "Who are we to argue with God as to how the potter makes any vessel" - [Rom 9:21]. The "election" is made before "having done good or evil" - [Rom 9:11]. Election is not because of God's fore-knowledge of what a person was going to do in the future; this is what many try to say to get around Scripture.

The 'gathering,' or the 're-gathering' as it is often called is always presented in the Bible as being that of Israel. Jesus mourned over Jerusalem - [Matt. 23:37] and His people whom He came to save ... not over any non-

Israel race. Jesus gathers only His elect nation - [Mat. 24:29]. Jesus gathers "together in one the children of God that are scattered abroad" - [John 11:49-52]. Note that they are "God's children" before they are gathered. In Ezekiel 37 the Dry Bones are stated to be those of both Houses making up the whole of Israel, and in the parable of the two sticks, that which is joined together are Ephraim and Judah. Right through the prophets, the story is the same; none but Israelites are gathered and the two parties remain Ephraim and Judah, that is, all Israel.

### WHO WILL JESUS ULTIMATELY RULE OVER?

"Out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people ISRAEL." Matt. 2:6.

"And the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David, and He shall reign over THE HOUSE OF JACOB for ever." Luke 1:32-33.

Here we are told the ultimate rule is stated to be over Israel. No one can make the "House of Jacob" or "Israel" mean all races. Denominations do not like these restrictions, and so ignore them

"Lord, will you at this time restore again the Kingdom TO ISRAEL?" Acts 1:6. Jesus agrees about the Kingdom being over Israel, but does not disclose the time factors.

### WHO IS BEING ADDRESSED IN THE BOOK OF ACTS?

The genetic fathers of Israel are mentioned in at least 20 verses through the book of Acts. These are the genetic/racial 'fathers' of those being addressed. God as being the "God of OUR fathers" and "the God of Jacob" is mentioned five times in the Book of Acts. In addition, consider the additional racially specific verses:

"Ye men of Israel, hear these words." Acts 2:22

"Let all the House of Israel know assuredly..." Acts 2:36.

"Ye men of Israel why marvel ye at

this..." Acts 3:12.

"For Moses truly said unto the fathers, a prophet shall the Lord God raise up unto you, of your brethren, like unto me..." Acts 3:22-24.

The limitation to Israel is specific. "Unto you" and "the fathers" confirms the limitation to the Israelites being addressed. That denominations like to extend this to include all races does not make it valid. Note that this is post-Pentecost, and in this church age; so it is not in this age that anything changed, even if most say it did according to popular teachings. The "fathers" and "your brethren" are again racially selective and are definitive.

"Ye are the children of the prophets ... and of the covenant which God made with our fathers." Acts 3:25. This is a RACIAL statement! It concerns only one race. Scripture is not supposed to be racist according to popular doctrine, is it? So when could this covenant to "our fathers" have changed after the Book of Acts?

"The word which God sent unto the Children of Israel..." Acts 10:36. This confirms the Old Testament in Psalm 147:19 where we read, "He showeth His Word unto Jacob, and His statutes unto Israel. He hath not dealt so with any nation..." Note the clear "not" in this verse. This also is racist, but it is Biblical!

"The God of this people Israel chose our fathers." Acts 13:17. There are a multitude of Old Testament scriptures confirming this racial selection. We cannot ignore the relationship between Israel, "our fathers" and the people being addressed. They are the same race!

"According to His promise raised up UNTO ISRAEL a



Saviour, Jesus..." "To give repentance to all **the people of Israel.**" Acts 13:23-24. This verse is one of many that say Jesus was raised up unto Israel. The original promise was made to Israel only. There are no statements at all extending this beyond "all men" of Israel in context. Again this is racial in purpose.

"Men and brethren, **of the stock of Abraham** ... is this word of salvation sent ..." Acts 13:26. We do not find any stream of references about the word of salvation being sent to any but Israel. This is yet another racial statement; we cannot change the meaning of "stock" and its 'kin' connection.

"And we declare unto you the glad tidings, how that the promise which was made **unto the fathers**, God has fulfilled the same unto **us their children...**" Acts 13:32. This is a straight genetic statement. The prophetic promise was made only to Israel. Who can really continue to pretend that Paul was speaking to non-Israelites [so-called 'Gentiles']. Paul goes on to tell about justification through Jesus "by which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses," Showing that he was speaking only to Israelites.

"For the hope **OF ISRAEL** I am bound with this chain." Acts 28:20. Paul does not say it is the hope of all races. Note that nothing has changed at the end of the Book of Acts.

**THE CHOICE** is between:

[a] The Bible which does not ever state explicitly that God is other than:

- the "God of Israel" [203 times]
- the "God of Abraham" [17 times]
- the "God of Jacob" [20 times]
- the "God of our fathers" [17 times and still used at the end of the Book of Acts, chapter 22:14]. - or -

[b] The universalist doctrine of the "fatherhood of God" or "the brotherhood of man" where God is supposed to be the God of every race. "God" here is not Jehovah, the God of Israel. This is commonly believed even if there are no direct statements. This is the belief of the Roman Catholic Church, the United Nations, most cults and other anti-Christ organizations, so this point is worth weighing up. The belief of most Christians comes from the misuse of "all," "every," "whosoever," and such words which we will look at shortly.

#### ASK THE BIG QUESTIONS

- [a] Which option is right?
- [b] If the first option changed, when was this? [We will look at Acts 28:28 and Dispensational Theory]
- [c] Where are all the references to God being the God of all the other races?
- [d] Where are all the specific direct references to God being the "Saviour" of other races?
- [e] Where are all the statements about Jesus being the Redeemer of other than the "all men" and "whosoever" of Israel, according to each context?

Those who want to declare that there has been a change have to be able to deny the unity of the scriptures which Jesus says cannot be broken. The prophets did not prophesy of any change, so there is no change in what was prophesied.

There are many scriptures that state that those to be saved were already Jesus' people before He came, but who were in an unsaved state. Look at the scriptures below and consider if people become God's people after they are saved or if they are God's people already before they are saved and redeemed. In reading these verses, see that what

is being talked about is the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy. Then ask again, "did this ever change, and if so exactly when"? The emphasized words below will help identify the subject people specifically in each verse.

#### WHO ARE SAVED AND TURNED TO GOD?

Look at the highlighted words; they eliminate all but one specific race only.

"And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call His name Jesus, for he shall save **His people** from their sins." Matt. 1:21.

"And many of the **Children of Israel** shall he turn to the Lord their God." Luke 1:16.

"He has helped His servant Israel, in remembrance of His mercy, as he spake to **our fathers**, to Abraham, and to his seed forever." Luke 1:55

"Blessed be the Lord God **of Israel** for He hath visited and redeemed **His people**, and has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the House of His servant David ... as He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets ... to perform the mercy promised to our fathers ..." Luke 1:68-69.

"To give knowledge of salvation **unto His people** by the remission of their sins." Luke 1:77.

"Behold, this child is set for the rising again of **many in Israel.**" Luke 2:34.

"But that He should be made manifest **to Israel**, therefore am I come baptising in water." John 1:31.

"The God of our fathers raised up Jesus ... to be a Prince and a Saviour ... to give repentance **to Israel.**" Acts 5:30.

Many Christians are fond of Isaiah 53, but they have not noticed the limitation of verse 8, "for transgression of **MY PEOPLE** was He stricken." The popular beliefs infer that Isaiah was wrong. Has this really changed to include every other race? Those who want to be able to say this have to be able to say just when it happened and why Isaiah and other prophets are wrong.

#### TO WHOM WAS JESUS SENT AND TO WHOM DID HE SEND THE DISCIPLES?

"I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the **House of Israel.**" Matt. 15:24.

"But go rather to the lost sheep of the **House of Israel.**" Matt. 10:6.

"I send my messengers before thy face which shall prepare the way before thee." Matt. 11:10.

In the latter verse from the Malachi message which is quoted in Matthew was **to Israel only**. It is recorded in the parables that the laborers were sent into the "vineyard," which is a limited area of application, and "last of all He sent unto **THEM** His Son." We do not find a specific statement about Jesus being sent to others. This is the particular "kosmos" that Jesus came to save.

"I must preach the Kingdom of God to other cities also, **FOR THEREFORE AM I SENT** ... and He preached in the synagogues of Galilee." Luke 4:43. Jesus confined His proclamation to Israelites, involving Judahites and Galileans.

"Therefore says the wisdom of God, I will send **THEM** prophets and apostles." Luke 11:49. The context he is totally of Israel.

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killeth the prophets, and stonest them **THAT ARE SENT UNTO THEE**, how often would I have gathered **THY CHILDREN** together..." Luke 13:24. Could we extend these scriptural limitations?



*“And He shall SEND Jesus Christ which before was preached unto YOU.”* Acts 3:20. Peter here goes on to tell about Moses’s prophecy about Jesus being raised up UNTO ISRAEL; the people being spoken unto as being the children of the prophets OF ISRAEL. Can we really extend this constraint and say Moses was wrong?

### **ACTS 28:28**

The popular “Dispensational Theology” suggests that God deals with different “dispensations” in different ways and they split the Bible up into dispensations. When it comes to the New Testament they say that God finished with the “Jews” at Acts 28:28 -[*“The salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles and they will hear it”*]-... at which time signs, tongues and miracles are said to have ceased. By “Jews” they mean wrongly that it is Israel that is finished with. They quote *“For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom,”* to say because God has finished with the “Jews” [by Jews they mean Israel], that signs, tongues, and miracles required for the “Jews” are therefore finished with too. To overcome the mention of tongues in the Book of Corinthians, they have to say that this book is included in the dispensation that ended with Acts 28:28. If they wanted to do so, they could also have said that the dispensation ended back in Acts 13:46 where Paul says *“Lo we turn to the Gentiles.”* But, we find the same word translated as “sign” as in *“for the Jews require a sign”* occurs 14 times through the New Testament after the book of Acts. We also find the word translated as “miracles” 68 times and “wonders” 4 times. So all these books of the New Testament also would have to apply only up to Acts 28:28.

There is no record of this teaching together with the “rapture” doctrine prior to 1830, and the proponents hide the fact that it originated in Scotland with prophecy made by a “tongues”-speaking 15-year-old girl names Margaret MacDonald. The teaching was popularized by J.N. Darby of the Exclusive Brethren and the notes of the popular Scofield Bible. The problem identities are “Jews” and “Gentiles” which do not refer to Israelites and non-Israelites as they insist, but to the House of Judah and the House of Israel. Dispensational Theology which divides up history into seven or eight “dispensations” instead of the two covenant periods, is just one of the many ways attempts are made to support the popular and traditional misunderstanding and use of the word “gentile.”

One of the incomprehensible things about those who support futurism and any form of dispensational theology is how they can quote Daniel 9:27 about *“the midst of the week”* and then say that the second half of that same week is sometime in the future. To do that they have to say things without prophetic or biblical basis like, *“God’s prophetic clock stopped ticking”!* The *“great persecution against the Church”-Acts 8:1]*- or the tribulation period from *“the midst of the week”* until the stoning of Stephen, was three and one half years [the second half of the same week of years]. At the end of this time the early church were “scattered abroad.”

### **GENTILES**

Determination of this word and its meaning are critical. Concordances and Bible dictionaries will not always help, and will often only show usage, not meaning. Vine’s Expository Dictionary points out that the word “*ethnos*” denotes *“a multitude of people of the same genus.”* It can refer thus to Israel or to non-Israel, but “*genus*” can never be converted into “*belief*.” In this paper we are not going to go through each book of the Bible to show that the traditional interpretation of this transliterated Latin word is wrong, but just to give sufficient example to show that the popular meaning is wrong. The following verse is said to be written unto the “*Gentiles*.” Look at this one verse below carefully and then ask if people being written unto were Israelites or not. Then ask the question, *“Whenever could this have changed within this church age”?* It had not changed at this stage which is within the present ‘church age.’

*“Moreover, Brethren, I would not have you ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the [Red] sea. And were baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea....”* 1 Cor. 10:1-2.

The whole of this book is in the Israel context and does not include anyone else but Israelites. There is a mass of such confirmation through the New Testament. It is the pre-conditioning about “gentiles” that blinds the eye.

In the KJV the word “*ethnos*” is translated 64 times as “nations,” 5 times as “heathen,” 2 times as “people,” and 93 times as “gentiles.” BUT, we also find the word “*hellen*” sometimes translated as “Gentiles.” The translators have made a sorry mess! Let us look further into this mess. Anyone who cares to take a look in any concordance will find that the words in both Greek and Hebrew for “Gentiles” are also used for Israel. Knowing this, then “have some fun.” For instance, anyone can transfer translations for a given word and quickly find that when God said to Abraham, *“I will make a great nation of you,”* it could equally be translated *“I will make a great Gentile of you.”*

Rebecca would have had two gentiles in her womb, and thus Israelites would have to be Gentiles. The word “Gentiles” refers to any group of people of a common origin, and never did mean what the Bible dictionaries try to make it mean. It is not difficult to “knock” the popular interpretation to bits of every reference in the New Testament that appears to contradict the right meaning of “Gentiles.” We can look at every so-called type, such as the Ethiopian Eunuch -[Acts 8:37]- that is used in support of the wrong meaning and show that they are not valid. Either a look into the original languages or simple questions give us the answer, in this case such as:

-*Would a black man have been allowed into the Temple at that time?*

-*What would a black non-Israelite man be doing going to an Israelite feast?*

-*Would we expect him to be reading the prophets?*

-*Could we be sure an Israelite could not have been in the employ of the Queen of Ethiopia?*

-*Why was there such a fuss when Paul wanted to take a*



Greek [suspected of being a non-Israelite] into the temple?

Anyone who uses a territorial/national term and converts the same into a racial term is liable to come to a wrong conclusion, every time. Yet, this is the common experience and teaching. For instance, when we read in Galatians 3:28 and Colossians 3:11, “Neither Jew nor Greek, circumcision or uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond or free,” it is popular to treat the territorial terms as being racial terms. Those who promote this should then be able to say how four racial terms could cover every other race. What this verse is saying is that it does not matter whether or not the Israelites came from Judea, Greece, Scythia, or whether or not they had a barbarian religion, and whether or not they had been circumcised. Further to this, when we read in Revelation 5:9, “And hath redeemed us by the Blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people and nation,” it is popular to miss out the meaning of “out” [ek] and make this mean “of” instead of “out of” to try to accommodate every race. The prophets only spoke about Israel in connection with both the Blood and who is gathered to the City. It is also recommended that those supporting the popular doctrine should have a good look into the different meanings of “Christ,” “Christ Jesus,” “Jesus Christ,” “Christ’s” etc. according to grammar. For instance, where “Christ” is a verbal adjective, no one has any right to translate and use it differently.

It is popular to claim that Ruth was a ‘Gentile,’ but Ruth was an Israelite who had been living in Moab. We read in the first verse of the Book of Ruth about Israelites going to live in the land of Moab. That their sons married “women of Moab,” does not tell us anything about race; Moab was where the women lived just as we find her Israelite family living in the first verse. Numbers 21:25-35 and Deut. 2:32-34 tell us how Israel killed off all the Moabites completely, and then occupied that land. For an Israelite to be known as a Moabitess is no different than Israelites being known as Judeans or Galileans. It was unlawful for any Israelite to marry other than an Israelite, so Ruth would have to be an Israelite. Because the Old Testament is so clearly racist we are quoting primarily from the New Testament, because this is where the changes are supposed to have been made. But, perhaps we should look at one more Old Testament verse which spells out the real position.

“If those ordinances depart from me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel shall cease from being a nation before me.” Jer. 31:36.

Note “the seed [zerah] of Israel.” Those ordinances, the sun and moon, have not disappeared yet, and so Israel is still the same people today. As the word for “nation” is the same as that translated “gentile” and “heathen,” we could equally read, “the seed of Israel shall not cease from being Gentiles before me.” We could even say Israel would not cease from being heathen! This becomes absurd if we take modern meanings. Yet, much more modern teaching is equally as absurd. .. to be continued - The **Two Parties**.....

## WARNING FOR CHRISTIAN RELIGIOUS LEADERS

by Lawrence Blanchard, ND, MDiv.

Sometimes I dream of a future opportunity to address a gathering of seminary students who are training for the ministry, usually as future pastors and preachers in

churches. As a graduate of seminary myself with over 35 years of teaching and growth under my belt, I would have one main message for them. That message is a loud and clear WARNING to future “Christian” religious leaders in any capacity. It’s the same warning I would also give to active “ministers of the gospel of Jesus Christ.”

### THE WARNING

What is the warning? I would say to them: Don’t ever think that you would ever be different from or not be classified with the first century Pharisees, Sadducees and scribes who were strongly condemned by Jesus Himself. (see Matt. 23:13-36). Don’t ever assume that what you believe to be true, correct and certain truth of the sacred Scriptures is actually the truth of what the Bible says. Because once you start to think that you know it all, and perhaps you could be wrong about some beliefs, you start to think of yourself more highly than you ought to think. And that leads to pride and possessive power.

It’s like “the chief priests and the Pharisees” who were deeply concerned that their religious prestige and control would be taken away because Jesus was outshining them. They said in John 11:47-48,

“What are we doing? For this man is performing many signs. If we let Him go on like this, all men will believe in Him, and the Romans will come and take away both our place and our nation.”

Henceforth, they plotted to take His life. Don’t think for a minute that you (and I) could not fall into the religious power trap and be condemned along with them.

### I CAN HEAR

#### YOUR OBJECTION

But you might say: “I can see that, but surely we know the Lord and we are so much more enlightened now with all this advanced scholarship today.” The religious leaders knew who Jesus was too. One of the Pharisees, Nicodemus, came as a representative of the leadership by night and declared to Jesus:

“...we know that You have come from God as a teacher; for no one can do these signs that You do unless God is with him.”

Even in their deviousness to try “to trap Him,” the religious leaders admitted the following to Jesus: “Teacher, we know that You are truthful, and defer to no one... but teach the way of God in truth,” (Mark 12:14). They knew who Jesus was and still they refused to humble themselves. They were the trained religious scholars and they were not going to be upstaged. They had religious tradition on their side, centuries of tradition. They had a reputation to uphold and protect.

#### MY EXPERIENCE

I’ve been there and God had to humble me—severely. It was hell going through it, but I thank God every day for what He has and continues to reveal to me according to the Scriptures.

As I have tried faithfully to testify to pastors the truth with the empirical evidence of the written Word of God, I

New Video

## A CONSPIRACY HISTORY OF THE WORLD

Andy Thomas

*speaks at the Open Mind Conference in Sept 2013. The topic was this title. False flag operations and Conspiracies have been used by kings and heads of state for centuries to induce the people to want to go to war against a so-called enemy, using lies and misinformation. This manipulation is still being orchestrated by royalty and our leaders. The weapons manufacturers and bankers make millions from selling weapons to both sides of the war.*

#CI-998 @ sug don \$8



have been met with resistance and condemnation. I can't tell you the number of times the door was slammed in my face, being ridiculed personally and excluded from fellowship. "Heretic" has crossed their lips more than once.

And why? Honestly, it's their only recourse because they cannot refute what I am telling them about what the Bible says and likewise they cannot defend their belief system. So, the only thing left is to kill the messenger.

There is no difference between these pastors and the religious leaders of Jesus' day. So far, I have not found one honest, honorable man among them.

### POWER OF BELIEF

This is important because religious belief has more influence to mold and shape the opinions of men and women, and more influence to direct the course of a nation than all the political and media power could ever employ. I will discuss this at length in Book Five, **The Greatest Deception of Our Time** (to be released early next year, Lord willing).

Pastors, you hold immense power by what you believe and teach. My admonishment to you is to never stop examining the Scripture daily to find out what the Bible says and what it means. Remember the warning to teachers from James: "Let not many of you become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a stricter judgment" (James 3:1). This is a very serious calling.

If you are looking for security or power or prestige - get out of the ministry.

I am among a small group of theologians that have been trying to introduce other pastors as well as other people to the revolutionary truth of the Bible according to the evidence of the Bible itself and from verifiable history. Truth that is relatively unknown by most religious leaders.

We have not had a great deal of success thus far. Mostly, we have been ignored or resoundly rebuffed and rejected on many an occasion. We realize that ours is a difficult task to try to effectively communicate to Catholic and Protestant religious leaders. It's like trying to teach medical doctors, steeped in the allopathic medical model, the truth about nutrition and how the body can heal itself. The indoctrination from medical schools and big pharma has been pretty complete. A seminary or Bible school education does the same thing. It's hard to break through the mind control.

Nevertheless, religious leaders have a very serious responsibility to know and teach the truth because, as the Scripture says, teachers "...will incur a stricter judgment" (James 3:1). It's one thing to personally believe something and another to teach it. If you are wrong and you teach others what is wrong, you will be held to a higher standard and condemnation will be more severe—unless, of course, you repent.

### ETERNAL JUDGMENT

There is a story in Matthew 12:22-32 of an encounter between Jesus and the Pharisees who were the religious leaders of that time. Jesus healed "a demon-possessed man who was blind and mute" (v.22). After Jesus healed this man he both "spoke and saw" (v.22)

When the Pharisees heard about it, they said that Jesus "casts out demons only by Beelzebul" (v.24). Who was Beelzebul? There are different theories about the identity of Beelzebul. Some say it goes back to a Hebrew name Baalzebub, which is referred to as an ancient pagan god. In the text of Matthew, Beelzebul is identified as "the ruler of demons" (v.24) and Jesus references "satan" only in respect to making a point that it was not possible that "Satan" could cast "out Satan" or else "his kingdom" would not be able to stand (v.26). (translators capitalize "Satan." The Greek word simply means "adversary." However, in v. 12 the term is in the masculine singular form and has an article before it. This means the term is a definite masculine subject, although not specifically defined as who it pertains to in this passage). So, the Pharisees' accusation really didn't make sense. But that wasn't the end of Jesus' response to them.

Jesus then posed the possibility that He was casting out demons "by the Spirit of God" and if that was the fact of the matter, then it followed that "the Kingdom of God had come upon them." 9v.28)

Then Jesus made a couple of statements as a warning to the Pharisees:

*"Therefore I say to you, any sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven men, but blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven. And whoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but whoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, either in this age, or in the age to come" (v.31-32).*

Speaking against Jesus was forgivable, "but blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven ... either in this age or in the age to come."

### BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE SPIRIT

Blasphemy is translated from the Greek word *blaphemia*. In classical Greek it meant "profane language, slanderous speech ... defamation, by which another person is damaged." (*Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, Vol. 3, p.341). In this Matthew 12 passage, blasphemy is misrepresenting the ministry and working of the Holy Spirit in the action of Jesus (healing the deaf and mute man) by attributing them as 'of the devil,' a completely contrary evil source of His actions.

Let's take this meaning of blasphemy now as "against the Holy Spirit" by identifying the Spirit. In the Gospel of John, the Spirit is called the "Spirit of Truth" (John 14:17, 15:26, and 16:13). The Holy Spirit is truth and reveals truth through Jesus the Christ and the written Word of God. Blasphemy against the Spirit occurs when someone claims that an action or belief is not the truth but is of another satanic, devilish source when it is actually the truth of God. Such a case is slanderous defamation against the Holy Spirit.

That's what the Pharisees were doing. As such, they were in grave danger of the unforgivable sin and eternal judgment. Jesus duly warned them.

### DON'T MISS THIS LESSON

Religious leaders today—pastors, teachers, evangelists, seminary professors, Bible study teachers, and so forth—must never believe that they are somehow exempt



from blaspheming the Holy Spirit. When men like me, who carry within us what we believe is a sacred message of the truth of God's Word, are told: "What you are teaching is of the devil"—**beware!** Don't get too cocky. Because if we are speaking the truth and it is of the Holy Spirit and you say it's of the devil, you may be in mortal danger.

This I can guarantee: We **can** defend our theological position. We don't know it all, but we know a significant part of the truth now more than ever. And it grieves us when religious leaders thumb their noses at us and the truth. Remember and consider, hear us out. Talk to us. Don't blow us off. Don't make a potential mistake that in reality could be blasphemy in God's sight.

The Pharisees, with the exception of a few, all died in their sin. Lost. Excluded from the presence of God forever—without hope. Eternal judgment—forever!

Blasphemy of the Holy Spirit of truth is war with God. I thank and praise God every day for rescuing me from false theology. By His grace, I was saved. I pray God's grace for you in the same way. There is still time and still hope. And yet, remember the warning.

[www.yourbiblicalheritage.com/](http://www.yourbiblicalheritage.com/)

## JAIL FOR US CLERK OPPOSED TO GAY MARRIAGE

A defiant county clerk has been jailed after insisting her "conscience will not allow" her to follow a federal judge's orders to issue marriage licenses to gay couples. Kim David was jailed for contempt on Thursday.

But rather than be fined, jailed or lose their jobs, five of her deputies told the judge they would issue the licenses.

"God's moral law conflicts with my job duties," Davis told US District Judge David Bunning in Kentucky. "You can't be separated from something that's in your heart and in your soul."

The judge said he was left with no alternative but to jail her, since fines alone would not change her mind. He had tried to keep Davis out of jail, saying she could go free if her staff agreed to comply with the law and she didn't interfere. But Davis rejected the offer, choosing jail instead.

Gay and lesbian couples vowed to appear at the Rowan County clerk's office again on Friday, to see if the deputy clerks keep their promises. "We're going to the courthouse tomorrow to get our marriage licence and we're very excited about that," said April Miller, who has been engaged to Karen Roberts for 11 years.

In a landmark ruling, the US Supreme Court in June found that gay marriage bans are unconstitutional, and the vast majority of government officials around the country have since adhered to that ruling.

As word of Davis' jailing spread outside the federal courthouse, hundreds of people chanted and screamed, "Love won! Love won!"

But Davis' lawyer, Roger Gannam, compared her willingness to accept imprisonment to what Martin Luther King Jr did to advance civil rights, and said "everyone should lament and mourn the fact that her freedom has been taken away for what she believes." But Laura Ladenwich, a lawyer for the plaintiffs, rejected the comparison.

"Ms Davis is in an unfortunate situation of her own creation. She is not a martyr. No one created a martyr today," Landenwich said.

Speaking earlier from the bench, Bunning said it would set up a "slippery slope" to allow an individual's ideas to supersede the court's authority. "Her good faith belief is simply not a viable defence," Bunning said. Before she was led away, Davis said the Supreme Court's gay marriage ruling conflicted with the vows she made when she became a born-again Christian.

"I promised to love Him with all my heart, mind and soul because I wanted to make heaven my home," Davis said. Miller and Roberts were denied a marriage licence four times by Davis or her deputies.

Miller testified that one of the deputy clerks told her to apply in another county. "That's kind of like saying we don't want gays or lesbians here," she said. Davis, an Apostolic Christian stopped serving all couples after the high court ruling in June.

[www.9news.com.au/world/2015/09/04/04/51/jail-for-us-clerk-opposed-to-gay-marriage](http://www.9news.com.au/world/2015/09/04/04/51/jail-for-us-clerk-opposed-to-gay-marriage)

(This appears to be an open-ended sentence, in that the judge intends to hold her in jail "until she agrees to issue licences for same-sex marriage bearing her name.")

This lady is a martyr, even though some may deny it. She is being jailed for refusing to go against her conscience. People were burnt at the stake for the same reason. Martin Luther also refused to go against his conscience. I wonder what would happen if the judge decided to treat a Muslim that way for refusing to eat pork - which is against his conscience? May our God be merciful to Kim Davis and visit the iniquity on judge Bunning!) [After 5 days in Jail, David was released—we await further developments].

*New Video:*  
**DR. JOEL WALLACH  
FULL PRESENTATION  
Osteoporosis, Arthritis, Cancer and  
Diabetes.**

*Dr. Joel Wallach talks about how the medical profession has legislated themselves into a protected monopoly. The worst place to be is in an American Hospital because they make so many fatal errors and the prescription drugs often kill people. You will be surprised at the alarming statistics of mistakes and incompetence by doctors. Obesity is due to a mineral deficiency. Myelin which is 75% cholesterol is essential for our brain function. Cholesterol lowering drugs (statin drugs) will cause diabetes or Alzheimers.*

**#CI-1000 @ sug don \$8**

## TRANSGENDERS WON'T "LIVE & LIE" - BUT THEY EXPECT THE REST OF US TO.

*by Benny Huang - Thurs. Sept. 3, 2015.*

I can't find Lila Perry's real name anywhere. The seventeen-year old gender-dysphoric male student from Missouri has become a news item in the past week because he wants to use the girls' changing room for gym class and oddly enough the girls aren't thrilled about it. A walk-out protest was held during the first week of the semester at Hillsboro High School to support the "girls' rights," while another smaller protest was held to support the gender-oriented student and his quest to use the wrong locker room.

After coming out as a "gay" male, Lila announced in February 2015 that he would henceforth identify as female, which I guess makes him a heterosexual girl ... who happens to be a boy? This stuff gets really confusing. Hillsboro High School accommodated his mental illness—and that's what it is—by allowing him to use a gender-neutral faculty changing room. As the new school year began, however, Perry decided that even this accommodation wasn't good enough. "I am a girl," said Perry, "I am not going to be pushed away to another bathroom."





I understand his point. If he accepts the gender-neutral changing facility he's necessarily conceding that he is somehow less of a girl than the others—which he is, of course. But because the entire point of this asinine exercise is to force other people to validate an enormous lie, no compromise is acceptable.

Nowhere in the whole mess can I find the student's actual name. I doubt his parents named him "Lila" because he wasn't born a girl. I suspect that "Lila" selected a more feminine name when he grew sick of being a boy. That doesn't make it any less a pseudonym.

Every media outlet I know of has chosen to share Lila's delusion that he's a girl, which explains why I can't find the student's real name anywhere—not in the Washington Post the New York Times or even on Fox News's website. They all refer to this gender-confused boy with feminine pronouns or as "Ms Perry." To mention that "Lila" is actually Bill or Norm or George would send the message that "Lila" is an adopted persona, which it is.

Some people will wonder what the big deal is. If people feel more comfortable in their skin when they "identify" as something other than what their chromosomes or sexual hardware define them to be, what's the big deal? And that's nearly always how this issue is framed—as people having the autonomy to define themselves which is the first step to *being* themselves. The rest of us are just big, mean bullies who want to force them to live as someone they're not.

But Lila Perry is a boy. That's a fact. He was, in the parlance of the homosexual movement "born that way." So if we're "forcing" him to do anything, we're forcing him to be what he is. I think he'd be a lot better off if he'd knock off of the charade and seek therapy before the homofascists make it illegal.

Speaking for myself, however, I must say that I don't want to force Lila to do anything. If he wants to revel in his mental illness that's his business—but he shouldn't make the rest of us join in. Unfortunately, there may be times when his right to believe a delusion will collide with everyone else's right not to believe it. Gym class happens to be one of those times.

Such is his dilemma—if he settles for the gender neutral changing room or, heaven forbid, the boy's locker room, he is in fact conceding that his feminine identity is a sham. But if he plows ahead with his false identity, he is essentially asking every member of his high school to assent to a lie. These are two mutually exclusive positions—either he will use the girl's locker room or he will not, either he will receive the validation he so desperately craves or he won't. There's no middle ground.

Lila's story reminds me of "Lars and the Real Girl," a 2007 film starring Ryan Gosling as the awkward and reclusive Lars Lindstrom. Lars has never had a girlfriend and most people in his small Wisconsin community suspect that he never will. The townspeople are surprised when Lars announces that he met a Brazilian woman named Bianca on the internet. Everyone thinks it's great that Lars finally found someone special.

As it turns out, "Bianca" is a life-sized sex doll that Lars purchased from an adult website. So yes, he did meet her on the internet ... in a manner of speaking. Lars nonetheless introduces her to everyone in town as if she's a real woman.

Out of a sincere desire to make Lars happy, the townspeople decide to humor him. How it would crush Lars if anyone were to point out that his girlfriend is in fact made of plastic. In time, the townspeople forget that they're playing along with a big goof and actually start to speak and act as if Bianca is real.

That's essentially what transgenders are asking us to do—pretend that we believe something we know to be a fiction. Bianca is not a real woman, and neither is Lila Perry, but for the sake of people's "feelings," we're asked to play along.

Be nice. Be polite. Pretend you believe the lie *until you do believe the lie. The emperor really does have new clothes, everyone can see them, right?*

It might be overly generous, however, to say that transgenders are "asking" us to believe a lie. The increasingly militant transgender movement is doing a lot more demanding than asking these days, a fact that conservative author and attorney Ben Shapiro can attest to. When Shapiro appeared on HLN's "Dr. Drew" to discuss Bruce Jenner's ESPY award for courage, he showed some real courage by dissenting from the host and five other guests, including Robert "Zoey" Tur, a male reporter who thinks he's a chick. Shapiro insisted that feelings play no role at all in determining a person's biological sex. After referring to "Zoey" Tur as "sir," "Zoey" put his hand on Shapiro's neck and proclaimed "You cut that out now or you'll go home

in an ambulance."

More examples abound—a woman at a Planet fitness gym in Michigan lost her membership when she complained to staff that there was a man in the women's locker room. They explained to her that she was violating their "judgment free zone" policy. A professor at Washington State University threatened to lower students' grades or even fail them, if they used any number of forbidden words, including "male" and "female." It's all getting very weird very fast.

The transgender community, like the homosexuals before them, are not happy to live their lives as they see fit. They crave acceptance, validation, even celebration. It isn't even primarily about them—it's about *you*, your attitudes, and your conception of their bodies. There are reliable indicators that they will not use gentle persuasion as a means of changing minds.

If you think you can hide out from this movement, you're wrong. Another Lila Perry is coming to a high school or office, or gym, or church—near you!

[patriotupdate.com/transgenders-wont-live-a-lie-but-they-expect-the-rest-of-us-to/](http://patriotupdate.com/transgenders-wont-live-a-lie-but-they-expect-the-rest-of-us-to/)

## THE LEGACY OF GOVERNMENT EDUCATION

by Mark R. Rushdoony

Those people who love liberty have had little to cheer about in recent generations. Those who desire to see a specifically Christian liberty in the context of a growing Kingdom of God in the West have had even less success, with one exception.

The future histories of the West will note the first cracks in the monolith of twentieth-century statism appeared with the revival of distinctly Christian education, first in the day

*Only a few Left!*

### 1599 GENEVA BIBLE

*Read the Bible of the Pilgrims and Reformers. It was used by God to spread the blessings of reformation, liberty, freedom, and productivity throughout the English speaking world four centuries ago. May He now be pleased to use its republication to do the same thing in our own day. Easy reading modern spelling typeset, all the original marginal notes.*

*Original cross-references*

**Hardcover #537 @ sug don \$67**

**Bonded leather softcover #538 @ \$87**



schools of the 1960s, then in the home-school movement a decade later.

Criticism and critiques of government education played a very real part, but had little to no effect on either government schools or future generations. It was the willingness to create and finance alternative means of education that has made this trend one of major significance. It has been the most successful program of Christian reconstruction to date. Nevertheless, the damage done by statist education is substantial.

### **“Public” Is A Euphemism For “Government”**

That which is “public” is always, in reality, “government.” What is public belongs, in principle, to everyone, so it belongs to no one. Civil government then creates an agency to oversee it, bureaucrats to administer it, and workers to operate it. All these individuals must be paid and provision is made for their retirement. Nowhere is cost effectiveness or efficiency a fundamental necessity, because government operations are always a political mandate financed by taxes and are never designed to be self-funding. A few years ago, numerous state parks in California were slated for closure due to lack of funding until it was discovered the park service had millions of dollars in fee income in bank accounts it had hidden from the legislature. The park service had been assuming all operating costs were to be financed through the state budget with no offsetting reduction for collected park entry fees.

### **Stagnation and Regression**

Civil government is a monopoly that ultimately represents the threat of power (by confiscation, imprisonment, penalties, or death). The truism that “you can’t fight city hall” becomes even more apparent as civil authority becomes further remote at the local, state, or national levels. All government tends to make its operations self-perpetuating; reform from the outside becomes nearly impossible.

The result is that government creates systems of organization and operation that are so cumbersome, they are impossible to reform except from the inside and so they stagnate. Civil government has no incentive to downsize and become efficient, much less to innovate or privatize. Each generation of students repeats the same dated list of subjects with no real inquiry as to the skills needed in the present. The high school math curriculum still has many absurd geometry and trigonometry calculations rarely encountered in real life yet fails to teach basic accounting or business math. The only innovation in curriculum, it seems, is in history and literature, where both are, in fact, set aside in order to indoctrinate in political correctness.

### **Contempt for Liberty**

Government schools are the torchbearers not of liberty, but of compulsion. “Compulsory education” is by definition not an education in liberty but conformity. The “liberal arts” is a term that originally implied there were certain things free men needed to learn to make their exercise of liberty fruitful. Instead, we have compulsion, as witness the widespread attempts in the 1990s to regulate or outlaw any parental choice in education. The general defeat of those efforts was one of the great victories of the Christian community in the last generation. The initial attack on home-schools in California was led by the State Superintendent of

Public Instruction, Bill Honig, who later went to prison for corruption in office.

Government schools cannot foster liberty because they represent a manipulation of citizens. The one consistent success of government educators is the production of young statistics. Periodically I have seen a parade of school children marshalled in support of one liberal cause or another. Such charades speak far more about the teacher’s manipulative skills than anything else. Those who are indoctrinated for twelve years or more in statist ideas are unlikely to bite the hand that feeds them. They are so entirely accustomed to “the government” in their lives, they seldom know any alternative.

All those in government schools are subject to the social experiments and fads of the system. At one time it was the declared policy of government schools to “Americanize” new immigrants. ‘Americanization’ is now considered a cultural evil, so those same schools now actively foster pluralism, as well as ethnic and linguistic identity.

A similar social experimentation was earlier suffered by Native Americans in the ultimate government system, the reservation. They were put on the reservation so they could maintain their way of life, but then it was decided they needed to be Americanized, so their children were forcibly sent to boarding schools and came back as strangers to their tribes. Later, this policy was reversed, and the government decided to re-Indianize the Indian, to preserve ways that were remote to modern life. Under each policy, the Indian was dictated to,

and treated like a laboratory experiment to be manipulated by all-knowing paternalistic government decrees from Washington DC.

Since the rise of the US Department of Education, public school students have likewise been the victims of social experimentation, and social, sexual, ideological, and political manipulation by remote bureaucrats taking their lead from a small cadre of social engineers in academia.

Government schools cannot teach liberty any better than can prisons. They can and do teach compulsion, regulation, inefficiency, manipulation, bureaucracy, and statism by bureaucrats, but not liberty.

### **Statism and the Decline of the Family**

It is the paternalism of the government educational system that is, perhaps, its most objectionable feature, because it injects a governmental authority into the family regardless of the content of what is taught. When Indian fathers tried to hide their children from, their forced deportation to boarding schools they were, at times, tied to a post until the child was surrendered. The issue was one of authority. The government employee of the public school acts as the uber-parent and his responsibility is first and foremost to the government. As I write this, there is news of a Georgia mother of an honor roll student being arrested and placed in shackles because her child had twelve absences, seven more than allowed. When a civil authority becomes tyrannical, the police power then becomes a tool of oppression.

If push comes to shove (as it frequently does these days) the family is always treated as subordinate to the state, who hands the children over to yet another state agency, Child Protective Services. Control is presumed to be the state’s, and the parent must seek its permission to

### **Clearance:**

## **OPERATION VAMPIRE KILLER 2000**

**by Jack McLamb and**

*Police Against the New World Order*

*Many of our internal Protectors know of the well-laid plan which will culminate to usher the US, along with the rest of the nations of the world into a “utopian” global community allegedly under the control of a “philanthropic” UN. A great many officers and servicemen are taking a stand against this plan because it was kept secret from the people, who were not allowed to vote for it.*

**While they last # 911 @ \$2.50**



reclaim custody.

The government school, where children are monitored by civil employees, has been the necessary facilitator of this tremendous power grab by the state. Compulsory education has, then, not too surprisingly led to compulsory vaccinations, to mandatory reporting, and to compulsory health care including abortion counselling and services. The state claims increasing authority over the family but does not accept the corresponding responsibility. Over and over we hear complaints of the lack of discipline and delinquency problems in the schools answered by blaming the home: "We got the students this way; it's not our fault."

### **Ignorance of Economics**

Government agencies like schools have budgets, but these do not correlate to the financial constraints in a business. Government schools have never operated under the same profit/loss demands of private schools or businesses. They instead propose needs and expect funding to be granted by school officials out of tax receipts. What students see around them, what they use in equipment, and the advent of new programs all depend on a distribution from government.

In the private realm the lack of resources presents a solution: pay for it. The obvious question then is, "Who will pay?" In a government school the only question is why isn't the school district giving us more tax receipts?

The economic system of government education is socialism. If the schools need funding the answer is the need for more taxation. The economics of big government becomes the economic model seen by the students and the parents: "I need, therefore someone else must be made to pay; it's their civic duty!"

### **No Independent Thinking**

Independent thinking is essential to liberty, but it is feared by statist. The statist sees education as a way of molding its citizens for the good of the many. Before its budgetary problems began a few years back, ideas were being floated to have a pre-school attached to every elementary school in California. That way, apparently, the state could "prepare" students for primary education. Yet the progressive educators have never been proponents of an early preparation that included reading, because independent readers become independent thinkers, and the purpose of "democratic" education in their thinking was a citizenry whose thinking was directed toward what they as visionaries of a better world deemed good for society. The word "democratic" came to mean "group think" (assuming the progressives were in charge of what that thinking was, as independent thinking became "regressive"). This is why homeschooling has been the target of such vicious contempt; it represents socialization out of the context of the statist social model.

The contempt for independent thinking is evident throughout government education. The bizarre math problems are not geared to a methodology that would provide real-life application but to a bizarre line of thinking deemed necessary by academics. Group projects, not individual competency and responsibility, have been the norm for many years. This creates a bureaucratic mentality where everyone shares in the accomplishments of the few. One young woman who received her education in Christian and homeschools was involved in such a project in college. The

instructor asked each member of the group to grade the others. One boy was incensed when he was given an "F" by this girl. "Why would you do that?" he demanded. "Because you did absolutely nothing!" she replied. He believed in socialism applied to grading. She believed in reward for productivity.

### **The Loss of Excellence**

It is remarkable that any child can come out of a government education with a commitment to excellence. If they do it is likely a reaction to what they have seen in the school. Teacher unions serve the teachers, not the students. Competency testing of teachers is resisted tooth and nail. Each presidential administration pushes a politically devised program which a new set of statist claim will reform and improve the system. George W. Bush's program was No Child Left Behind. It was a failure. Barack Obama's program is the bizarre Common Core. Each time one fails another is offered to solve the same problems. Each is an attempt to fix government ineptness with a government solution.

If any private enterprise had the dismal record of government schools, there would be a hue and cry from the statist for government oversight to solve the problem. Of course, once the government controls something, reform is nearly impossible. The only solutions will come with alternatives to it.

### **Secularized America**

Over fifty years ago my father described education as necessarily religious. Today, it is not uncommon to hear the public school referred to as the state's sacred

temple. People who are trained by the government tend to become statist humanist. Christianity is now a remote idea in American thought. Few are governed by its tenets, even in the church, where the anti-theonomy, anti-dominion crowd seek to deny the faith's implications for the culture.

Modern man has been reared in the temples of the state and is now moving from being ambivalent toward Christianity to the virulent hostility of true believers. Still, being anti-Christian is not a positive, forward-thinking ideology. All that this anti-Christian secularism has done is to move men away from God. It has not created a culture-building ethic or ideology. The destruction caused by statist humanism is becoming readily apparent. Our modern world is nearing a dead end at a high rate of speed.

### **Some Good with the Bad**

The assaults on Christianity have produced some positive results in the church itself. Statist humanists are always focused on the here and now because that is all their ideology acknowledges. This has forced the church to address real-world contemporary issues which has brought at least a segment of it out of the pietistic "spiritual" other-worldliness into which it had lapsed by the middle of the twentieth century. First came the Christian day school movement. Then came the anti-abortion pro-life movement. It took some time for Protestants to organize against the *Roe vs Wade* ruling on abortion. When they did decide to oppose it on Biblical grounds, they had to turn to the Old Testament, of all places! At least the church is abandoning its pietism on an issue by issue basis. When it does so consistently, it will know a relevancy it has not seen in several generations.

Moreover, the opposition to the secularists has not been by the large, institutional church, but by individuals and

## **A Must add to your collection: ISRAEL'S CALENDAR AND THE TRUE SABBATH**

*by Curtis Clair Ewing*

*Some 50 years ago S.W. Gamble, a Methodist minister published a book dealing with Sunday as the Sabbath found in the Bible. The book had several reprints. Now Ewing has added a large number of additions which years of study on his part has enabled him to add. It is well worth your careful study #750 @ sug don \$4.95*



smaller Bible-believing churches. The homeschool movement has demonstrated that there are millions who have not bowed their knee to the Baalim of our day. The dynamic of the Christian resistance to statism is the individuals who have said, "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord!" It is likewise with those courageous pastors who sometimes have to fight their own members, church boards, and denominations to proclaim that, not the state - but Jesus Christ is King.

The government school has been the single greatest mechanism of America's degradation, but the answer is not to fight it but to let it die a natural death. Its funding mechanism will continue to fail it.

The fight we face is a positive one for the Kingdom of God and His Anointed. If the public schools collapsed today we would have a cultural mess, one comparable to that created by the collapse of the U.S.S.R. We must build for the future, and today we have a core group dedicated to doing just that. There is hope because Jesus is on His Throne and the Father has promised to put all enemies under His feet. One of those enemies is government education.

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

## THE KINGDOM OF GOD

by Jay Nauss

We live in an age which is fast moving, and no one knows what the future holds. So much is changing at such a rapid pace that many are facing what could be called: "Future Shock." It is not first time that the world has faced such a time as this. We read in Genesis 11:6, "Anything that enters their mind, nothing which they propose to do will be impossible for them." I believe we are living in similar days as they were in those times. Science and technology are moving at a rapid pace, in so many areas, that what was new yesterday is obsolete tomorrow.

Many philosophies have been advanced in the last few hundred years, and put forward as a basis in which to establish society. These have all had their supporters but have failed to deliver on the promises for a better society, and happier people. Socialism, Communism and corporate Capitalism have all been tried, and are still being tried, but the results testify to their failure.

I would like to demonstrate that there is a better way to organize society, and the blue print is in the Bible. It has been there for all to see and study, since the Kingdom of God was established to the Israelites under Moses and Joshua over 3000 years ago. Although the system as it was instituted then failed because men thought they could design a better system (*give us a king, like all the nations*); time has proved them wrong.

Let us consider some ideas, based on Biblical principles, that would result in a much better system of government than that which we now witness in the nations of Jacob.

Let us first consider the money system, as that is what we hear so much about today. Let us consider how a theocratic money system would work to our advantage. First, we have to accept a few things as fact: 1. There is a Creator. 2. He created a people for Himself. 3. Our people, the people we know as the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic-Germanic-Scandinavian and kindred peoples, the Israelites or Hebrews—our ancestors—are those people. I believe that the Bible was written to, for and by the Hebrews, and it is for us today. It is up to date, and the answers we need are in that Book.

Back in the days of Abraham, when his wife died, he

weighed out the money, bought the field from the Hittite and buried Sarah. Abraham weighed the money. It wasn't coinage, it was gold and silver by weight. That was the way they were doing things in those days. They didn't go to the bank, they didn't write a cheque, they didn't have American Express or Visa card. Later on, coinage came into existence. Coins were issued by the ruler; silver coins and gold coins, and they had a certain value. Coinage facilitated the buying and selling of goods and services.

Money should only be used as a means to an end, and not an end to a means. We need a money system of some kind. We could have gold and silver or a local currency by the municipality or whatever. Merchants could issue Scrip to be used by the people.

The nations of the world are in massive debt (America is actually in a worse debt situation than Greece). What is the Biblical solution to the debt? Every seventh year there is to be a debt release. This is a calendar date. If someone loans money to someone else and it's in the third year of this cycle - and if the debt is not paid by the end of 6th year, the lender is to forgive the debt. You might say, "That does not make sense." If the loan was for \$100,000 in the 4th year of the cycle and the borrower paid back \$30,000 he still owes \$70,000. But I am to write off and forgive the debt. This, at first, seems ridiculous, but it does stop people from worshipping money, and I believe that is why this command was given. If you forgive the debt that is owed to you, you are stating

that money is not your god. It is not the first thing in your life. Your life will continue whether you get those thousands back or not; and it takes away the coveting of money. We are told in the commandments, "Thou shalt not covet." One would not lend large amounts for business ventures, but go into a joint venture situation where both stand to profit. Lending was for those in dire straits who were poor—therefore for daily essentials.

### TAXATION

At the present we are probably paying 60 to 70 percent of our income in various forms of taxation. The Biblical tax is 10% of the increase. If someone makes a \$100,000 profit from a crop of grain, he would pay \$10,000 in tax. You might think that would not be enough money to run the system, but we need to decide what kind of system we want to have. If government is going to give you everything, they will also be able to take everything from you. And that is what is presently happening. Too much is spent on government perks and projects that are unnecessary, and supporting those things the tax was not meant for. We have to decide what community projects are needed and how they will be funded. People should be free to join insurance schemes, which schemes in turn are not overregulated to the point of being unviable.

Let us briefly consider corporations and capitalism. Corporations are registered and given limited liability. Why should a corporation or any entity be absolved from liability? If individuals have to be responsible for their actions, and pay the penalty for what they do wrong, then corporations should be treated in a similar fashion. Limited liability for corporations should be abolished.

Any society that displaces a family or fails to accept it as the centre of life of an orderly system is destined to fail. We are now seeing an attack on privately held land. The reason why governments want to get control over local councils is that through local councils, government can get more control over private land.

*LOAN Video you may have missed:*

### THE FEDERAL RESERVE

*a discourse by G. Edward Griffin.*

*Who drafted the plan for the Fed and when?*

*How is money created? Should currency be backed by gold or silver?*

**#CI-684 @ sug LOAN don \$7**



Governments have sold off so much of the public's assets, they now want to get control of the land. If government gets control of the land; what will be their next objective?

In ancient Israel, an Israelite could not sell his land (it belonged to God) so that his family would not be left without an inheritance in the land. An inheritance is the right by law to receive possessions or property which is one's inheritance or birth right. "God declared: the land shall not be sold forever, for the land is mine." (Lev. 25:23). Owners could lease the land, but a definite time period was set, after which the land must revert back to the original family. The land could NOT be taken by tax levies, for no tax was to be levied against a man's inheritance. All real property, all land could NOT be taxed by any authority. There could be no land tax. You could not be dispossessed of your land. And this is the system we should have re-instituted today. No mining or oil company would be able to encroach on a farmer's land.

To accept tax on land is an admission that the state is sovereign, and the state is saying that it is god. The state has assumed godhead, or rather, the state has become god-walking-on-the-earth.

Besides the 7th year debt release, there was also the 50th year of Jubilee (which began halfway through the 49th year, much like the financial year, running from the 7th month through the 6th month of the first year of the next cycle). The 50th year saw another larger forgiveness of debt of the land. If you owned land, you could lease the land to someone else and at 50th year that land was returned to its original owner. During the 50th year Jubilee, every man was to return to his own family inheritance which was restored to him. It was a system of private ownership with no place for communism.

When Jesus the Messiah came 2000 years ago, He was preaching the Kingdom of God. When you do this and appeal to a Higher Authority today, you will come into conflict with the ruling powers of the day. They consider themselves to be gods. Two thousand years ago, Caesar was revered as a god and worshipped as deity.

In western nations there is a great deal of land that has been alienated into public land, such as national parks, state forests and so on. There is therefore much land that could and should be distributed amongst the people (but not to the so-called asylum seekers, who should not dwell in our land). There is no Biblical injunction for the government to own any land at all.

Let us not consider how we should be choosing our government representatives. In the Kingdom that was set up when our ancestors came out of Egypt and went into Palestine, under the leadership of Joshua, the land was divided amongst the people and the laws were given to them concerning how to run the system. It was done without a king. Almighty God was to be their king.

There was no voting of people into office as we know it today. Representatives were appointed into office and the basic system was leaders of 10, leaders of 100 and leaders of 1000. Under the present system we have political parties and the party chooses who is to be the candidate. The people have no say in this. The inner circle of the political party decide who the candidate will be. A candidate is

expected to be faithful to the party and not go against the party's wishes (as a repayment for the party helping him to get elected). Under a Biblical system, the representative would have to be a Christian. The man would have to be a fellow Israelite and not one of another race. He would have to fear God (start along the lines of 1 Tim. 3:1-5). A man who didn't fear men. One who is schooled in the Laws of God. One who has written out his own copy of God's Law. Even the king, who replaced the judges in the Old Testament, was to write out a copy of the Law and read it every day. One who observes God's Law in his own life. A man of truth and one who is just. One who is unable to be bribed. Neither greedy or covetous. One who is a terror to the wicked and a champion of the righteous. There might have been very few who would meet these qualifications, and even if they did, they could still be disqualified because of their wife and children. Because he must manage his own household well. He must be the head of his own house, with dignified, sober and non-rebellious children. So you

can see that it was a high standard. How many men in key government positions today would meet the criteria - or approach it?

### CRIMINAL LAW AND PUNISHMENT

What does Scripture say about law and punishment? First, there is the death penalty for capital offenses, such as murder, rape, kidnapping, striking parents, cursing God, homosexuality and others. For minor offenses, there is corporal punishment from one to forty lashes with a whip. For stealing and destruction of another man's property, restitution was to be made to the victim—not to the state—to which may be added 100 to 500 percent. If your car was stolen the thief would have to restore two cars. If you made your living with a fishing boat and your boat was stolen, the thief would have to give

you five boats (or work until they were paid off - under threat of death penalty if he refused).

Today, if someone steals from you and gets caught, they go to jail and your taxes pay for his prison confinement and you don't get restitution.

Those who are unable to make financial restitution or pay the fine are obliged to contribute their labour until the debt is paid. However, someone else could make restitution on behalf of the thief, such as a friend or relative. If the criminal couldn't afford to pay the restitution and had no one to come forward on their behalf, then they were to be put into indentured labour and be obliged to work off the debt (and their possessions could be sold)

### USURY

"Thou shalt not lend upon usury to your brother, usury of victuals, usury of money (of substance - not credit), usury of anything that is lent upon usury." If you lend money, you are not to charge usury.

The banking system as we know it, with its funny money would go out the door (every time they make a loan, they create the amount out of thin air and increase the money supply - hence, inflation) We would have a fairer money system. Theocratic money would be gold and silver, or anything that could be exchanged. If one had land with a gold mine, that gold would be yours and you could coin it and spend it into circulation (you have to do a lot of work to extract it!) This applies if you had land with oil on it; it

## Expand your understanding THE SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD and CIVIL GOVERNMENT

by John Weaver

*Sadly the Biblical truths that empowered, inspired, motivated, and invigorated our forefathers have virtually disappeared from most pulpits in the nation today; thus they are no longer a part of the great experience of freedom. But men and nations will never be the recipients of the blessings, protections, and prosperity which only the sovereign God can bestow until they acknowledge, confess, and bow in submission to Him.*

#302 @ sug don \$23.85



would be yours. There would be complete property rights.

### GOVERNING AUTHORITY

The governing authority would be local government. We don't need a centralized system. The worst thing that has happened to modern nations was the setting up of centralized governing authorities (large corporations and unions included). It has consolidated power into the hands of the few who take unto themselves more and more power. Central governments have signed agreements with foreign nations, or those of other races. Israel was to be separate, dwelling alone. Israel was NOT to be reckoned amongst the nations. Of course, it is not separate today (because of its transgression of God's Law they were dispersed among the other nations for punishment), because of multiculturalism and its many gods. If you want to change the culture of a society, change the religion of that society and you change its culture. We now have all kinds of competing cultures in this country, each warring against the other (because of ungodly constitutions). This is NOT the way it should be.

### LAWS OF WAR

Some western nations have troops in various countries around the world. This should not be the case. Biblical Laws of war state, that males 20 years old and upward (not women) are to be trained for warfare, but only volunteers would be sent into combat. Before soldiers were to go into battle they would be asked, "Are you afraid?" If they said they were afraid, they would be exempt from going to war. A man who had gotten married would be exempt from military service for a year and the same applied if a man had started a business. The military should only be used to defend the nation, and not to go warring into other nations that pose no threat. Treaties that have been signed with the United Nations should be cancelled immediately, and membership in that organization should be cancelled also.

The military is to be a militia type military and not a standing army. There must never be a professional standing army (a police force is a form of standing army as well). There should be a cadre of trainers to train the 20-year-old males and then they would be sent home with their equipment to be ready at short notice to defend their homes, villages, towns, cities and nation when necessary. A system such as this would deter any would be foreign aggressor. (like in Switzerland where the men take their military weapons home with ammunition).

Other things could be discussed and other examples given, how the Kingdom of God could operate NOW on the earth. This has been but a brief introduction touching on some main points. An introduction to studying this further.

### ADAM DE WITT ANSWERS:

*Question:* Dear Hank, first let me say that I do enjoy receiving all the articles from you.

Yet while you state that all views and opinions are not necessarily those of the CIM, it is nevertheless [at least to me as a true seeker of Truth] disappointing to see that at times rubbish such as that of 'Adam de Witt Answers' confronts the reader. Also some BI Authors such as Arnold Kennedy who because of their apparent BI bias go crazy with some of their explanations in their attempt to strengthen the theory.

*AdeW:* It would be interesting to know what things I write are deemed rubbish, but each to his own in that case. A mere statement of "rubbish" or "go crazy" is simply an opinion.

While as to all this you rightly say that the reader is to guide their own studies, there are probably a few subscribers to CIM who may be at their early stages of considering

the BI message and are either confused with some of the ideas of authors such as de Witt and Kennedy or otherwise feel that they are no more on the "right beam" than are their denominational Preachers.

*AdeW:* I believe the answers are clear enough.

While I am not writing these words asking or expecting them to be published in the Covenant Messenger, I nevertheless feel that it would perhaps be a good idea in that you might find that there are quite a few readers with this same view. I expect that CIM would not include views and opinions of BI teaching from mainstream church people, and for good reason; and for the same reason, I suggest that it might be a good idea to take the same attitude with BI correspondents who need challenging on some of their views and opinions instead of simply letting them off Scott Free.

*AdeW:* I did not know I was teaching BI, thanks for the insight.

I feel that if I was to identify myself I might receive from you words meant to put me in place, and I would respect that but because I believe that my remarks are worthy of consideration I would probably finish up in a nasty sort of debate with you. So just let me be known as "The Fussy One."

*AdeW:* No time for nasty debates. I answer as honestly as is doable.

*HR:* Normally I would not entertain anonymous letters, and have an appropriate place to file them. But, because most of the criticism was aimed at Adam and Arnold, I did want to pass it on to Adam to respond. In future, any mail which cannot be identified as to its origin, will go to an appropriate place [its hot and burns!]. If I did not find Arnold's work of GREAT value, I would not have taken the time and effort to publish his **EXCLUSIVENESS OF ISRAEL (#714 @ \$23.95) our best seller -----**

*Question:* Are only the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic-Germanic-Scandinavians considered God's chosen people, or is it also the southern Europeans and slavic peoples? Why - or why not?

*AdeW:* Southern Europeans and Slavs are part of the same family IF they are not hybridized with other races, and that also applies to Northern Europeans, Australians, Americans and so on. There are also many in Australia, for instance, who have very swarthy features and are part Aboriginal or part Afghan (when they built the Ghan railway, many Afghans were brought here) or part Chinese. So the rule applies to all who are deemed Caucasian, no matter where they live. There is a sizeable kin stock also in South America, we are scattered wide and far, but our numbers are few due to propaganda resulting in low birth rates and the melting pot policies of all (what was the) Western Nations.

*Question:* Why did God make all the different races?

*AdeW:* Why did God make many types of trees, or fish, or cat-like, dog-like, horse-like and so on? God made many types of species and we can reason our sense of logic to it, but God is the creator and as such has Creator's rights. God made many species and he saw to the end of many species. There were many types that are called people which have died out, such as Java Man, Cro-Magnum, Neanderthal, Hottentot, and so on. God used ancient blacks to wipe out the mega beasts by burning the food supply down and thus turning jungles into grass lands. The end of the Mega beasts means that we can build and plant without some huge creature crushing our homes and farms. The other species called people were not created for us to mix with, they were created to pave the way for us—and when we disobey God's Law—to test us.-----

Thanks to you all! May our God bless us and preserve us in these perilous times, and send his protection

*Hendrik (Hank) Roelofs* 14

