



Christian Identity Ministries

A member of the
Congregations of Israel

PO Box 146, CARDWELL, QLD, 4849, Australia

Ph: 07-4066 0146 (International 61-7 instead of 07) www.christianidentityministries.com - hr_cim@bigpond.com

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

#354

Covenant Messenger

Nov AD2015

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

THE BIBLE, RACE AND CULTURE, PT 4.

by Arnold Kennedy

.....continuing.....

THE TWO PARTIES

The traditional meaning of the words "Jews" and "Gentiles" are so ingrained into the subconscious that it is hard for anyone to think they might mean something else. After the time of Solomon and all through the prophets, the two parties are:

[1] The House of Judah. Two tribes. or the "*Circumcision*" [The Jew of the N.T.]

[2] The House of Israel. Ten tribes. or the "*Uncircumcision*." [The Greek or nations of the N.T.]

They are whom the "*middle wall of partition*" - [Eph. 2:14] is between. A "middle" wall is in the middle of one thing, not in the middle of two quite different things. The one race in two Houses exists today with a wall between them, because the time of total fulfilment about joining them together again into "one body" does not occur until Jesus returns. When the Apostle Paul concludes his argument about the Jew and Gentile, he says, "*and so shall all Israel [both parts] be saved*"-Rom 11:26.

GRAFTING TOGETHER AND "NEITHER JEW NOR GREEK"

Of course, we all know that grafting in can only take place between trees that are both of a common origin, such as Israel and Judah are. In Romans chapter 11 it is popular to say that metaphor, "contrary to nature" means the grafting of things quite different together, suggesting the grafting of non-Israelites into Israel. But Vine points out that it means the grafting of a wild stock into a cultivated tree, rather than the normal grafting of good stock into a wild original. This of course refers to the House of Israel joining the House of Judah. The House of Israel had been divorced by God whereas Judah had not. If we look at the expression, "*God is able to graft them in AGAIN*," those grafted back must have been attached once before they were cut off. The problem again is the Latin word from which we get "Gentiles;" if the meaning was non-Israelites then these non-Israelites were never attached once before.

Where Paul talks about "*neither Jew nor Greek*" in Col. 3:11 he is talking to the "elect" who always are **Israel as a whole**. The same applies in Gal. 3:28 where those who had been under the Law [Israel as a whole] become equal and "all one" as they individually come under the New Covenant. John 7:35 tells us about those of Israel who are dispersed among the Greeks. What misleads most people is the mistranslation of "hellen" in the New Testament. In no

way could "Greeks" mean all the races who were not Judeans. Why would Paul pick just on "Greeks" [meaning Greek speaking] if he meant all races? It has to be noted that the translators did not translate here; they used the Latin-origin word "Gentile" to suit their doctrine.

STRANGERS

In the Old Testament there certainly are scriptures that look as if they are saying that non-Israelite strangers could become circumcised, keep the Passover, the Laws of Moses and thus become as "*one born in the land*." The immediate necessity is to look at the word "*stranger*" and similar words like "foreigner," "sojourner," and "alien." In both the Hebrew of the Old Testament and the Greek of the New Testament there are at least eight different words translated as "strangers," "foreigners: and "servants," etc and this is the problem. Our translators [this includes the N.I.V.] have no system of consistent translation of any one of these words. That there are "strangers" who are Israelites and "strangers" who are not Israelites is very obvious. The most common word with which there is mis-understanding is the Hebrew word "*ger*," that is translated as "stranger/s" 86 times out of the 92 times it occurs in the Old Testament. The meaning of this word might be summarised as being an Israelite who was living apart from the main body of Israel, i.e. living among, or in the land of, other races. The important fact is that this stranger was an Israelite by race. A

IN THIS ISSUE:

The Bible, Race & Culture, pt 4,	1
Misuse of 'Church' and 'Gentile,'	5
What is Disease?	8
Do You Know the Healing Power of Laughter?	8
Is Your Home Uplifting?	8
Sam Blumenfeld's Counter-Revolution,	9
Separation of Church and State - Inside the Church, 11	
Cold Dead Things,	13
Dallas Theological Seminary,	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.

word-by-word examination will show the premise about non-Israelites becoming part of racial Israel is not valid. In the wilderness, the congregation of Israel contained both Israelites [the *qahal*] and also a mixed multitude [the *edah*], both of whom were travelling together. Only the 'qahal' could attend the tabernacle. Both *qahal* and *edah* are translated as 'congregation' which makes for confusion.

ADOPTION

The whole popular presentation suggesting that anyone can be "adopted" into Israel is false. Paul says in Romans nine, "Who ARE Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption." Thus it does not pertain to anyone else than Israelites. From the Extended Vine's Expository Dictionary:

"The A.V. 'adoption of children' is a mistranslation and misleading It is not a putting into the family by spiritual birth..... Israel was brought into a special relation with God, a collective relationship not enjoyed by other nations."

Paul writing unto "Gentile" Israelites says Israel alone are the people out of whom the sons can be placed. These people who can "be led by the Spirit" from the bondage of the Law into the "glorious liberty of the Children of God." Only Israelites had been under the bondage of the Law. The word "huiiothesia" is never used to mean "make anyone a son." It is to "place a son." Each son who is placed already exists as a son. The Greek does not suggest making anyone a son, and some lexicons point this out. Strong's G5206 also gives "the placing of a son."

Following this up in Thayer we find: "That relationship which God was pleased to establish between Himself and the Israelites, in preference to all other nations ... It also includes that blessed state looked for in the future life after the visible return of Christ [Jesus] from heaven i.e. the consummate condition of the sons of God, which will render it evident that they are the sons of God."

"Which have the firstfruit of the spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." Rom. 8:23.

In this verse we can see an explanation of what "adoption" is, namely the redemption of our body. Adoption is not available to all and sundry. There is no way "adoption" refers to the popular concept of presently bringing non-Israel into Israel. "Adoption" does not apply to all and sundry.

THE GALATIANS 3:16 PROBLEM

There is a major translation error in Galatians 3:16 where the verbal adjective "christ" has had a capital "C" put on it to create another meaning. As the verbal adjective it reads, "And to thy seed which is anointed." The "as of one" in this verse refers to Isaac out of all of Abraham's seed (he had 7 sons). A reading through many commentaries will show how many commentators have copied each other for many years in saying something like, "It is appropriate to say by the Holy Ghost" to try to say that Paul did not mean what is written. This is to try to support the popular doctrine that the genetic seed of Abraham through Isaac has somehow become the seed of Jesus. It is really not only difficult but impossible to convert the "sperma" of Abraham into a spiritual seed! If any want to maintain this idea, then when exactly did the promise to the "sperma" of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob change into a spiritual seed?

Jesus was a "minister" to confirm the promises made to the fathers of Israel -[Rom 15:8-9]- that the nations of Israel [mistranslated 'Gentiles'] might glorify the God of Israel. It is the House of Israel who were 'gentilised,' living apart from the temple system following their captivity in

Assyria. The "all nations" [sometimes mistranslated as "Gentiles" and "heathen"] that were to be blessed in Abraham were none other than the Tribes of Israel. This is verified from both accurate translating in both Hebrew and Greek, and from the English. Both Abraham and Joshua were asked to walk through the length and breadth of the land, but neither walked through the entire globe, did they? The "land" here and the "earth" are the same word "erets" in the promise given to Abraham in the "in thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" -[Gen. 12:3]. The popular concept that "all the nations of the earth" means all the races in the earth does not hold water. The promises to Abraham were passed on to Isaac and Jacob as a genetic line. Did Jacob [Gen. 49] prophesy about any besides the sons of Israel for "the last days"? Did Moses prophesy anything different? -[Deut. 33] When is this supposed to be changed and dropped? No universalist will touch what Jacob and Moses say here.

THE CHURCH

The *ekklesia* are certainly called out, but "out" from where? It is popular to say it is out of "the world," but the calling is of sons [*huios*] out of the children [*teknon*] of Israel under the New Covenant, which covenant was made

with the same people with whom the Old Covenant was made. No race but Israel had an "Old Covenant." This "world" where the church is called out from is the "kosmos of Israel," it is not from the "oikoumene" or inhabited earth as is commonly taught. Each particular "kosmos" is determined by its context. There are no statements either in prophecy or in the New Testament to say that the New Covenant is made with anyone else but the House of Judah and the House of Israel -[see Hebrews 8:8-9]. The Redeemer is never once spoken of as other than the Redeemer of Israel, so when is this supposed to have changed? Were the prophets really wrong?

The supposed antithesis between, Law and Grace, Israel and the Church, which has been the subject of multitudes of difficult books over many years, disappears when we realise that Jesus Christ did not terminate the Law, but is Himself the climax or *telos* of the Law in harmony with the Law. Paul, in 2 Cor. 3:6, claims to be a minister of the New Covenant, with the Old Covenant; it is the veil that is taken away from Israel when Israel turns their heart to the Lord. The total Law is not disposed of; it becomes written upon the hearts of Israelites -[2 Cor. 3:3].

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN

This is impossible to spiritualise. "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the Kingdom **TO ISRAEL**" -[Acts 1]. The reason why the 306 references about proclaiming this Kingdom is not carried out is because the Kingdom is made out to be something else by trying to spiritualise it. The throne of David over Israel is forever -[2 Samuel 7:12-16 and Luke 1:30-33]. From the Extended Vine's Expository Dictionary [page 626] we can read, "The Kingdom of Heaven ... is used only ... in connection with Israel." Vine details the difference between the 'Kingdom of Heaven' and the 'Kingdom of God.'

ISRAEL, GOD'S FIRST-BORN SON.

It is often said, "As Creator He is father to all men, but he is the 'spiritual' Father only to believers." Although there is one reference in Malachi 2:10 that appears to be at variance, the context is strictly Israel only, God being the Father of the particular "us" being addressed. In other

New DVD

Humanity vs Insanity

The Cancer Agenda

Cancer - the Forbidden Cures

Drinking Baking Soda for Health Benefits

Big Pharma trying to bring about the demise of everything natural and replacing with synthetic content because that can be patented which brings in the big money. Pharmaceutical companies don't want a cure for cancer.

#CI-999 @ sug don \$8



verses, “as many” is not “all.” Through scripture Father=“ab” simply is NOT used in the creative sense but consistently in the sense of a person who fathers children. Moses was to tell Pharaoh, “**ISRAEL IS MY SON, EVEN MY FIRSTBORN.**” [Ex. 4:22] Under God’s Law “*all the firstborn of thy sons shalt thou redeem*” -[Ex 34:20]. God says, “*All the firstborn are mine*” -[Num 3:13]. “*All the firstborn of my children I will redeem*” -[Ex 13:15]. God does not break His own law by redemption of or for everyone else as is commonly taught today, although obedience to the father is still required of the other sons. The Church is the church of *the firstborn* -[Heb 12:23] in the New Testament, the general assembly being plural.

“GO INTO ALL ‘THE WORLD’ ...“to every creature”

So far we have only skimmed the surface and made some points. From here we will look in more detail at the two much-loved verses which are used to contradict the flow of scripture.

“For God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved.” John 3:16-17.

“and He said unto them, go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.” Mark 16:15.

These are two much-quoted verses. “The world” has been emphasised. In both cases it is the same word “kosmos” in the Greek. This word “kosmos” is probably one of the least understood and mis-used words in the New Testament, and perhaps we should take a short-cut and make statements about the word “kosmos” that is usually translated as “world.” It does not mean every race or the inhabited earth -[“oikoumene”]. Nor does it mean the land mass of the earth or its soil.

Its prime meaning is “order,” “arrangement” or “beauty,” but never the common multi-racial meaning as taught. It often means that particular world which is being spoken about, to the exclusions of other “worlds.” It can refer to other things than people, e.g. the adornment of women’s hair [-see 1 Tim 2:9 where “kosmos” is translated as “modest”]. This is particularly hard to preach the gospel unto! “Kosmos” is spoken of, not only as the world that now is, but also of that which is to come. [Do we preach to the world to come?]. “Kosmos” is used of the world that was before the flood -[2 Pet. 2:5]. This world was destroyed -[Heb. 11:7], although the principle continued through Noah and Abraham. “Kosmos” can mean the whole ‘world’ of wicked and reprobate men as opposed to the “world” of God’s elect. “Kosmos” is used of many other things and these can include either order or disorder, fame and honour, the orderly universe, the stars in the universe and even heaven!

So, which “world” of all these “worlds” did God “so love”? From the scriptures we can see that there are differing kinds of “worlds.” In the Old Testament we are told that God loved Israel. There does not seem to be a single direct reference to God loving any other race. Let us consider the Israel order [or ‘world’] whom God says He loved in the Old Testament.

“But the Lord loved you, and because He would keep the oath which he sware to your fathers...” [i.e. Israel] Deu.7:8.

“The excellency of Jacob whom he loved.” Psa 47:4.

“I will mention the loving kindnesses of the Lord ... and the great goodness toward the House of Israel ... in his love and pity he redeemed them ..” Isa. 63:7-9.

“... according to the love of the Lord towards the children of Israel.” Hosea 3:1.

“When Israel was a child, then I loved him ... I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love.” Hos. 11:1-4

“The Lord thy God in the midst of thee [i.e. Israel] is mighty, He will save, he will rejoice over thee with joy, he will rest in His love.” Zeph 3:17.

“Yet I loved Jacob ... and hated Esau.” Mal. 1:2

N.B. If God hated just Esau, then Edom could not be included in the “all” of “Go ye into all the world” and “God so loved the world.”

Quoting from R.K. and R.N. Phillips in “The Book of Revelation,” part 2, [page 25]:

“For those who are firmly convinced that the one who was crucified is Gentle Jesus, meek and mild, please note that He is capable of hate. The Greek word is “miseo,” to hate, regard with ill-will, to detest, to abhor. This puts the followers of the Nicolaitanes in the same category as Esau [whom God hated before he was born]. If deeds have nothing to do with resurrection, why does Jesus make such a statement about the deeds of the Nicolaitanes? If all men are equal before God, why did God hate Esau before he was born?”

In the Old Testament we have expressions of the Israel people that God “so loved.” Cast the mind back to all the scriptures in the New Testament we have looked at which show the exclusive nature of Israel. Both tell of the love of God for Israel in a way which separated Israel from the other races. Are we now to believe that this people Israel have somehow disappeared, despite prophecy to the contrary? If any reader still has reservations about “the world” having different meanings, we will look at pairs of verses each of which contain the words kosmos= “the world.”

Pair One: “The World cannot hate you, but Me it hateth.” John 7:7.

“Marvel not, my brethren, if the world hates you.” 1 John 3:13.

If both of these two “worlds” were the same, then the disciples could not be hated by a world that was not able to hate them. Both worlds are “kosmos,” but are different worlds.

Pair Two: *“I have manifested Thy Name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world.”* John 17:6.

“They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world.” John 17:14+16.

In one verse they are out of “the world” and in the second they are not of “the world.”

Pair Three: *“I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are Thine.”* John 17:18.

“God so loved the world.” John 3:16.

Might it not be blasphemy to suggest that Jesus would not pray for that world He loved? So He would have to pray for one “world” and not for another! Here are demonstrated three pairs of scriptures which show contrasts in the “worlds” they are talking about.

THE “WORLD”-“KOSMOS” OR “OIKOUMENE”?

These two words are both translated “world,” but they are different in application and meaning. “Kosmos” is determined by context to say which particular world is being spoken of, whereas “oikoumene” roughly means the inhabited earth in general. [We recognize a difference between the world of music, and the world of sport].



We can see the true meaning of “*oikoumene*” easily in verses where it is used like Luke 2:1 where Caesar was to tax “*all the world*” and Acts 11:28 about a famine throughout “*all the world.*” In Acts 17:6 where the disciples “*turned the world upside down.*” In Acts 19:27 we read about “*all Asia and the world*” worshipping the goddess Diana and in Acts 24:5 about Paul being said to be “*a mover of sedition throughout the world.*” In Rev. 3:10 Jesus speaks about the “*hour of temptation which shall come upon all the world.*” In Romans 10:18 we are told the Word of God went “*into all the earth*” and “*unto the ends of the world.*” When we remember that both parts of Israel were scattered among the nations this is easily understood. We might say that the “*kosmos*” of Israel was scattered throughout the “*oikoumene.*” Jesus came into the “*oikoumene*” [Heb. 1:6] to minister to the “*kosmos*” of Israel.

God’s love to the Elect is in no way limited. He so loved this “world” of His Elect. This is the order of Israel He loved and sent His Son to redeem. This is whom Jesus died for. It is pointed out again, He came “*to save HIS PEOPLE from their sins.*” Scripture says, “*Whosoever believeth on Him shall not perish, but have everlasting life.*” We have to look at which “world” is being addressed and see that the “*whosoever*” refers to “all” of that part being spoken about and not “all” of everything. Lexicons support this. The context here is Israel, so “*whosoever*” refers to “*whosoever of Israel.*”

When we go back to the Old Testament scriptures with understanding we will see many references that say that part of the total law, namely the Statutes, the Judgments and the Ten Commandments were given to Israel ALONE as a covenant. This is vital to understand. Redeeming Love can only mean redemption from the curse of a broken Law. This Law Covenant had not been made with all races. Israel is the world Jesus came to save. He “bought back” or redeemed Israel. No other races could possibly be redeemed or “bought back” again, because they had not been there in the first place.

When Jesus said, “*I am the light of the world,*” the “world” in each case is the “*kosmos*” not “*oikoumene.*” The disciples of Jesus were to be lights to the “*kosmos*” of Israel, not the “*oikoumene.*” This is confirmed when Jesus told the disciples to go only to the lost sheep of the House of Israel. What has changed, and when did it change?

We find a similar difference that is often missed with the word translated “earth.” In Isaiah 54:5, for instance we read, “*Thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, the God of the whole earth shall He be called.*” The “*whole earth*” does not mean the whole globe. The word in this verse and others similar is “*erets*,” each race has its own separate “*erets*” or land. John 1:1 confirms this, “*He came unto His own, and His own received Him not.*” There are two different words for “own” in this verse; one is His land etc, and the other is His people. It is popular to ignore the differences between “*kosmos*” and “*oikoumene,*” and also the differences between “*erets*” and “*ge*” because they cannot fit in with popular all-race doctrines.

WHICH “WORLD”?

Earlier we quoted Mark 16:15 about going into all the “*kosmos*” and “preaching” [i.e. proclaiming] the gospel to every creature. Which “world” were the disciples to go into? This is a fair question. When the disciples were sent

to the “*Lost sheep of the House of Israel*” to whom and to which “world” were they sent? When Jesus said in Matthew 15:24, “*I was not sent EXCEPT to the lost sheep of the House of Israel,*” to what race was He sent? Are we to say Jesus was wrong, and that He was sent to every race? Are we to say Jesus was wrong in sending His disciples only to Israelites? If the disciples were told, “*go ye into all the world,*” why did they not go to the Negroes, the Chinese or the Indians? Why did they choose only one direction and go to where the Children of Israel were? Where the House of Israel were at that time can easily be established historically. They were in parts of the old Greek Empire, this is why these Greek-speaking Israelites are called Greeks.

“*He departed thence to preach in their cities*” Matt.11:1

“*Go not into the way of the nations, and into any city of the Samaritans, enter ye not, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and as ye go, preach saying, the Kingdom of God is at hand.*” Matt 10:6.

The disciples were instructed specifically not to go to certain peoples. The disciples of Jesus went out from Galilee knowing exactly where to find these “lost” sheep. They were not so “lost” that they could not be found! The disciples did not stay in Judea with the Judean Israelites either! These “lost” or apollumi sheep of the House of Israel were “set for correction.” They needed saving, as well as the Judean Israelites.

“**ALL,**” “**EVERY ONE,**” “**WHO-SOEVER,**” “**EVERY CREATURE**” ETC.

Consider again these verses:

“*God so loved the world...*” John 3:16.

“*Go ye into all the world...*” Mark 16:15.

Such verses are the basis of the thought that the “*go and preach the gospel to every creature*” of Luke 16:15 refers to, going to every person of every race on earth. Let us consider some of the words in these verses.

[a] Preach or “*kerusso*” means to proclaim, or to announce good news like a town crier. It does not mean “to make disciples” or “to evangelise” as many teach.

[b] But where were they to make their proclamations? Was it to every one of every race? Let us look at “every creature.” The Greek word “*ktizo*” is given by:

Strong’s G2936-7 as “*original formation, building, and ordinance.*”

Vine’s Dictionary of NT Words says “*ktizo*” is “*used among Greeks to mean the foundation of a place, a city, or a colony.*”

Thayer’s Lexicon says: “*To make habitable to people, a place, region, island.*” The verb “*ktisis*” is the act of creating as in Romans 1:20 and Gal. 6:15 and indicates the product of the creative act. Thayer says further, “*The act of founding, establishing, building,*” and “*of some particular kind or class of created things or beings.*”

This is the “creature” in Mark 16:15. The word “*ktizo*” in the classics is used in the sense of a village, or place where certain people live. The disciples were to go specifically to the places or the villages, cities, colonies or places where the Israelites lived.

“*Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel until the son of man be come.*” Matt. 10:23.

We cannot make “the cities of Israel” to mean the cities of every race. Note here that Jesus is speaking primarily of



the time of the end. What is the area of evangelism? Is it not all the world of Israel? What were they teaching? Was it not the Gospel of the Kingdom? The Kingdom is what Jesus and John the Baptist came proclaiming, "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Who proclaims that today? It is impossible to believe and teach both the traditional universal gospel to all races and the exclusive Kingdom of Heaven over Israel at the same time.

Here Jesus is talking about the end of the age. Likewise, He confines "all the world" to the cities of Israel! In other words it is the dwellings or places throughout the earth where the Israelites live, right up to the end of the age. In the Old Testament, there is not a suggestion that Israel should try and convert other races so that they could join Israel and thus share the same inheritance. The inheritance land was not promised to other than the 'Seed of Abraham.'

"ALL," "EVERY," etc. ARE LIMITED EXPRESSIONS

In other words, does "all" usually mean "all of everything" or "all of that part being spoken about only." Does "all the world" mean all the planet, or just all of that part of the planet being spoken about? A look through Young's Analytical Concordance will show how these words are used. This will give an indication without having to go into the Greek. Being certain on this topic is well worth the time involved researching lexicons and concordances. To grasp the use of "all" in Greek and Hebrew, consider Deut 28:10, "And all the peoples of the earth shall see that thou art called by the name of Jehovah, and they shall be afraid of you." Here, "all the peoples of the earth" does NOT include Israel. In the same way, "go ye into all the world" is not all inclusive of every race. Failure to understand this is the source of error in the normal teaching. Jesus says that it is not given for everyone to hear or to understand. Immediately we have just one exception then "every" and "all" cannot include that exception, or the other exceptions. If an exception is made about the Edomites who cannot find repentance, or those Jesus said, "Leave them alone," then these cannot be part of the "all" being addressed. Jesus did not preach to certain peoples, as we have seen. It is recorded that Jesus said ten times, "Who hath ears to hear, let him hear." Consider whether or not this means that there are those who cannot hear. Jesus said to the Edomite leaders of Jewry, "Ye cannot hear my words" - [John 8:43]

"GOD WILL BE GRACIOUS TO WHO HE WILL BE GRACIOUS"

"Therefore hath He mercy upon whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth." - Romans 9:18.

God does what He wants. So, is He really gracious to everyone of every race? We are told about the Potter who makes one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour, and about vessels "fitted for destruction" and a different lot of vessels "afore prepared for glory." It is the Potter who fashions the vessels from the raw materials before they have done either good or evil. Paul asks who we think we are to argue with God? - [Rom. 9:20]. Yet denominations still think God is wrong and want to argue this!

To those who say, "All is now of grace to every one of

every race," listen to the much-loved writings of the well-known author Selwyn Hughes in "Every Day With Jesus," in the daily reading for 17th February 1994:

"The word 'grace' is unquestionably the most significant single word in the Bible, I agree. But it must be understood right away that grace is a characteristic of God which is exercised only towards those who are seen as having a special relationship with Him. Nowhere in the Bible is the grace of God ever mentioned in connection with mankind generally, though some theologians frequently use the term 'common grace' [a term not mentioned in the Bible] - the idea that God gives a special form of grace to the whole of mankind which restrains them from being as bad as they could be. The other day I came across a writer who said, "The creation of the universe was an exercise of grace." I understand that he might have been using the word 'grace' as a synonym for love, [a mistake often made by Christian writers], but strictly speaking the exhibition of grace is reserved for the elect..."

Selwyn Hughes then quotes Arthur W. Pink as saying:

"Grace is the sole source from which flows the goodwill, love and salvation of God unto His chosen people."

Quoting from "The Best of Spurgeon" pages 62-3

"Why should not Jesus Christ have the right to choose His own bride?"

"You must first deny the authenticity and full inspiration of scripture before you can legitimately deny election." "Whatever may be said about the doctrine of election, it is written in the Word of God with an iron pen, there is no getting rid of it. To me it is one of the sweetest and most blessed truths in the whole revelation, and those who are afraid of it are so because they do not understand it. If they could but know that the Lord has chosen them, it would make their hearts dance for joy."

We just cannot change the racial basis of election; the New Covenant opportunity being given to both houses of Israel - [Heb. 8:8]. We cannot say the Bible is not racist. The mechanism for bringing the other races into subjection is by them witnessing God's blessing upon Israel as Israel obeys God. The principle shown by Jesus is when others witness "that ye have love one for another." When Paul took a contribution from Macedonia it was for the "poor saints" at Jerusalem,

not for all and sundry of the poor. Denominations like to extend this beyond the context of "yourselves" because they think that "yourselves" means all races. So feeding the hungry and foreign aid is extended beyond the purposes of God.

In the end, the word of the Lord **TO ISRAEL** [Mal. 1:1] and **TO THE SONS OF JACOB** [Mal. 3:6] is "That they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up My jewels" - [Mal. 3:17]. This is not addressed to any but those of Jacob/Israel who become sons. Have a look through the scriptures and see who these "peculiar," "special" jewels are. Psalm 135:4 says, "For the Lord hath chosen Jacob for Himself, and Israel for His peculiar treasure" .. [or jewels]. In the New Testament they are still the same holy, separate, elect, precious, peculiar people.

....to be continued... **IN THEE SHALL ALL NATIONS**

THE MIS-USE OF CHURCH AND GENTILE

by pastor Robert Bruce Record

No two words have done more to confuse the thinking of the people of Christendom than have the words **Church** and **Gentile**. It has been imagined, or taken for granted, that they are translated from the Hebrew and Greek, but such

New and Recently Listened to CDs & DVDs

B-520 The Book of James, pt 20,

Dave Barley

B-521 Standing in the Faith, pt 1,

Dave Barley

E-452 The Minority, Don Elmore

E-453 Main Center of Jewish Life,

Don Elmore

G-951 By Grace Alone, Romans: pt 44

Ted Weiland

G-953 Troublesome Times, Bah! pt 1,

Ted Weiland

J-428 Blessing the Lord, pt 4,

John Weaver

J-429 A Token of Perdition, John Weaver

U-134 Independence Day, Doug Phillips

CI-1002 The Truth About the Sodomites,

Steven Anderson



is not the case. And to them have been given a meaning that the Lord never intended.

Because of its use, or mis-use, in connection with the church, let us look briefly at the word Gentile. Popular usage has made it to mean everybody except the Jew.

But what are the facts?

Frederick Haberman in his book *Tracing Our White Ancestors* (#306 @ \$18.65), points out "There is no equivalent in the Greek for our term *Gentile*. It is an English word and found in no other language. *Gentile* is derived from the Latin *gens*, meaning *tribes*.

"Paul said **I am an apostle to the ethnos**, meaning *nations*, or *tribes*, and meant in this case, the **tribes of Israel**. In general, however, the word *ethnos* is translated 'heathen.'"

I point this out here to show the absurdity of speaking of the church as either heathen or Gentile. Yet it is being done all the time.

What shall we say of the word Church?

What is its derivation? By way of answering this question, let us turn to *Smith's Bible Dictionary*, where we read "The derivation of the word is generally said to be from the Greek *kuriakon*, meaning "belonging to God." But the derivation has been too hastily assumed. It is probably connected with *kirk*, the Latin, and "circus, circulus," the Greek *kuklos*, because the congregations were gathered in circles.

Now, because the word *church* is not found anywhere in the Old Testament, and because of its use -- or mis-use -- in the New Testament, it has been almost completely disassociated from any teaching found in the Old Testament.

As an example of this I will call your attention to a footnote in the *Scofield Reference Bible* which attempts to 'enlighten' the reader on Jesus' words in Matthew 16:18, where the word church appears for the first time. The Greek word translated church is "*ecclesia*," meaning "an assembly of called-out ones." and with this as a definition of the word *church*, the footnote reads: "Israel was a true church, but not in any sense the N.T. church -- the only point of similarity being that both were 'called out,' and by the same God. All else is contrast."

Such teaching has been a great evil, and has done almost irreparable harm to the thinking of God's people. The connotation that has developed around the word *church* has led to the creation of a theology which blinds people to the continuity of Old Testament teaching with that of the New.

A popular teaching abroad in the land is that the Old Testament has to do with Israel, or the Jew, while the New Testament has to do with Gentiles, or a non-Israel people. This mistaken concept developed around a mistaken identity of the Israel people.

Such teaching is but the mistaken theology of men which makes the Word of God of none effect.

What God Planned from the Beginning

We understand from Matthew 25:34, that it was to set up a kingdom of righteousness here on the earth. In the building of that kingdom, God chose a people in Abraham to be His servants and witnesses. Almost from the beginning, therefore, this covenant people were an assembly of called-out ones. This truth is recognized in a *Biblical and*

Theological Dictionary published for the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, back in 1857. "This covenant people were distinct from the other people and races. They were in every sense of the word a true church."

The church alluded to by Jesus in Matthew 16:38 was simply the old assembly of called-out ones established under a new and better covenant with new ordinances of worship.

That the Israel of God was destined to sonship is seen throughout the Law and the Prophets. From the beginning it was the intent and purpose of God to indwell His people. In Leviticus 26:11-12, for example, we find God promising that if they would obey Him and walk in His statutes, then He would take up His abode among them and be their God.

While this promise to Israel had a partial fulfillment when God later dwelt among them in the Tabernacle, and in the Temple, we need to turn to 2 Cor. 6:16, for its deeper and fuller meaning. Here we find Paul quoting from the passage in Leviticus in these words

"What agreement hath the temple of God with idols? For we (not ye) are the temple of the Living God, as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people."

Need I remind you that the promise of God in Leviticus 26 was to Israel? And Paul is here declaring that the promise was having its fulfillment in this Christian dispensation in the people to whom it was promised.

How Many People see this?

God was literally to indwell His people. And this body of believers is not a gentile church. It is that assembly of called-out ones who for many years looked forward to

Jesus the Anointed, but which now experience the salvation of God through faith in the finished work of Jesus on the cross. The yearly sacrifices for sin by the high priest were a constant reminder to Israel of their need of a Saviour. It was their schoolmaster until the Anointed.

And when, in the fullness of time **God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that they might receive the adoption of sons**, or as Moffatt puts it, **that they might have their sonship** ... this all had to do with Israel. This was God confirming the New Covenant promised to Israel in Jeremiah 31:31-33, whereby God would put His Law in their inward parts and write it on their hearts.

This leads us to consider the words of Jesus on that memorable night as Jesus commemorated the coming Passover with His disciples. As He took the cup, He said **This is My blood of the New Covenant which is shed for many for the remission of sins**. How many people who partake of this Supper have the slightest idea of what He was saying? Jesus is saying that He was about to die as Testator of the New Covenant - which covenant, of course, was predicted in the Abrahamic Covenant.

Hebrews 9:16-17 tells us that **Where a testament is, there must also be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead**. This all had to do with the redemption of God's ecclesia, His assembly of called-out ones.

In Galatians 3:13, Paul says **The Anointed has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a**

Old Historic Video:

GET YOUR PRIORITIES STRAIGHT

Stephen E. Jones

THE FIRSTBORN SON OF GOD

Stephen E. Jones

JUST TRY IT!

Sheriff Richard Mack

3 messages on one DVD.

Sheriff Mack was one of the first to oppose the Federal government's anti-gun laws.

#CI-238 @ sug don \$17



curse for us; for it is written 'cursed in everyone that hangeth on a tree.'

Who had incurred the curse of the Law? Israel, and this redemption provided by Jesus was national. Many, I fear, do not see this. While Israel as a nation has yet to come into an experiential knowledge of that redemption, it is assured and guaranteed them by the blood, which Jesus shed on Calvary.

Having said all this, let us now take another look at the words of Jesus to Peter in Matthew 16:18, *I say unto thee, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.'*

We must keep in mind that when Jesus uttered these words, there was no such thing as a book called *The New Testament*. Jesus had not yet died, and Paul had not yet been converted. The only Scriptures the disciples had, and from which our Lord Himself preached, was what we call *The Old Testament* (they had the Greek *Septuagint*, which had been translated into Greek about 250BC). When our Lord therefore spoke of building His church — not on Peter — but on a personal faith in Himself as the promised Messiah, was He referring to something taught in the Scriptures, and with which the disciples were familiar? Or was He introducing *something new*? Let us see.

Let us now go over some things which we have already covered in part so as to get a clearer picture of this assembly of called-out ones that God is building. In the Greek it is the word *ecclesia*, and while it may be used of any assembly of people called together, it is used in the Scripture to designate Israel.

The word *church*, on the other hand, has had a connotation given to it that makes it include most everyone but Israel. In the Old Testament Scriptures it is the Hebrew *qahal*, meaning a congregation, or “what is called together.” This is the designation given to Israel after the exodus from Egypt.

It is so used in Genesis 35:11 and Genesis 48:4. It was this assembly, or congregation of called-out ones, to which God gave His Law ... which Law they persistently broke, leading ultimately to their divorcement. Having failed through human weakness, they stood in need of redemption and restoration.

James refers to this fallen assembly in Acts 15:16, as *The tabernacle of David which had fallen down*, but which Jesus had come to restore and raise up again. Jesus had come to put the kingdom nation back on track again.

This new *ecclesia* was actually a re-structuring of Israel on a better foundation. Jesus was to become the new Fountainhead of the nation of Israel. That this is so, is further borne out by Jesus himself in Matthew 15:24, where we find Him saying *I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel*.

That God has been calling out a people for His name in this Christian era, no thoughtful or informed person will deny. But to assert that to teach, that this assembly of people whom God is calling out is made up largely of Gentiles, or a non-Israel people, is wholly unScriptural. Yet you hear

it all the time.

How, then, shall we account for such an unScriptural doctrine becoming so popular throughout Christendom today? I think the basic reason lies in the fact that most of the people of Christendom have mistaken the Biblical identity of the people of Israel. Having limited the Bible to the ‘Jew,’ a religious sect classed with Protestants and Catholics [there are Jews of all races], the rank and file of religious leaders have swallowed hook, line and sinker, the lie that God in this Christian dispensation has been building a Gentile Church, made up largely of non-Israelites.

These same religious leaders have divided the world up into two camps: Jew and Gentile (according to Jewish indoctrination, because to the Jews, there are only two kinds of people - Jews and non-Jews) To their way of thinking, therefore anyone who is not a Jew must be a Gentile. And, since the Jews rejected Jesus and would have none of Him, there is thus no one left of which the church could be comprised.

To say that our people are confused is to put it mildly. They are so confused that politician and clergy alike stagger like drunken men as they endeavour to cope with our mounting problems.

Think with me for a Moment

For God to set Israel aside, the people with whom He made His covenants and promises, and whom He chose to be His servants and witnesses and in this Christian era turn to a heathen, ‘Gentile’ people with whom He had **no** covenants, and who were strangers to God and His promises, and use **them** to do Israel’s work is nothing short of a flat denial of the Sovereignty of God.

“But,” you ask, “Didn’t Paul say that he was an apostle to the Gentiles?” He certainly did. But here again that phony word ‘Gentile’ is substituted for the Greek word, *ethnos*, meaning “nations.”

Paul is saying that he is an apostle to the nations.

But What Nations?

Let us not forget that in Matthew 21:43, our Lord declares the kingdom was being taken from Jewry and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. And this nation could be none other than the nation of Israel.

Most theologians either ignore, or they seem all unmindful of the fact that Abram’s name was changed to Abraham because he was to become the father of many nations. And it is most singular that when Paul went on his missionary journeys, he went westward into the region of Asia Minor, whence Israel had migrated in their westward trek to their new home in the West. The Galatians, the Ephesians, the Corinthians, the Thessalonians, etc., were all heathenised Israelites, and Paul’s letters to the churches in these areas so indicate. These people were not Chinese, Japanese, Indians, or Negroes. They were God’s Israel who later because the Caucasians who moved into Western Europe to become the English, the Scottish, the Irish, the Dutch, German, Swedes, Danes and Norwegians, etc.

Essential reading:

PASSIONATE HOUSEWIVES DESPERATE FOR GOD

Jennie Chancey and Stacy McDonald

Do you wrestle with cultural messages that demean the homemaker’s calling and exalt instead the emotionally androgynous power-woman—the wife whose worth is measured only by the degree of her ambition, the shape of her body, or her money-making skills? Such is the image of the “desperate housewife” that the modern media, culture, and feminism are promoting with great energy. Hear a former “Christian” feminist share how she went from a die-hard homemaker-in-training to a dedicated career woman and then back again—after God gripped her heart. Consider the beautiful picture painted in Scripture of the truly fulfilled homemaker who glories in the hopeful calling God created for her. Lay aside stereotypes, and dispel the myths.

#987 @ sug don \$23.15



Strange, isn't it? Or - *isn't* it? How the Reformation and religious revivals took place in the lands of the white man? Strange, isn't it, how we white "gentiles" have embraced Jesus and Christianity and have carried the Gospel to the rest of the world, while the Jews and other nations have remained non-Christian or heathen?

For those who have eyes to see and ears to hear, this is all proof-positive that God has poured out His spirit on Israel ... as he had promised. Here in the lands of the white man are assemblies of called-out ones, churches, which worship God and Jesus His Son.

God is not getting this church ready to leave the earth, but to live upon it in the Kingdom of our God.

"It is easier to fool people, than to convince them they've been fooled." — *Mark Twain*..

WHAT IS DISEASE?

by Adolphus Hohensee.

Disease, regardless of what the name may be, is merely an effort of nature to free the system from conditions that result from a violation of the laws of health.

When sickness overtakes us, it is our duty to first ascertain the cause.

Then unhealthful conditions must be changed and wrong habits corrected immediately, without delay.

DO YOU KNOW THE HEALING POWER OF LAUGHTER?!

Norman Cousin's recovery to health in spite of medical doctors' prognosis of death is uplifting, and an encouraging lesson for each of us.

Norman Cousins wrote a book *Anatomy of an Illness* that describes his amazing story, which is full of hope for all of us!

In 1964 doctors found that the connective tissue in his spine was deteriorating, a condition known as Ankylosing Spoudylitis. Doctors speculated that his chance of survival was approximately 1 in 500.

Faced with this impending death sentence, he pondered what role he might be able to play in his own recovery, and eventually did three things totally contrary to medical opinion:

1. He did his own research on all the various drugs he was on. He discovered that his condition was depleting his body of Vitamin C and based on his own research, he got doctors to take him off several of the drugs he was on and to inject him with extremely large doses of Vitamin C.

2. He made the decision to check himself out of the hospital and into a hotel room. Norman Cousins had concluded that hospital routines with their haphazard hygiene practices, culture of negativity, and routines that disrupted basic sleep patterns, contributed to his feeling that the hospital *was no place for a person who is seriously ill*.

3. He got a movie projector and a large supply of funny films, including numerous Candid Camera tapes and several old Marx Brothers' movies. On his first night in the hotel Norman Cousins found he laughed so hard at the

films, he was able to stimulate chemicals in his body that allowed him several hours of pain free sleep.

When the pain returned he turned the projector back on and the laughter would re-induce sleep. He was able to measure the changes in his body by measuring his blood sedimentation rate, a key measurement of inflammation and infection in the blood. He found the rate dropped by at least 5 points each time he watched one of those movies.

Once off every drug, except vitamin C and laughter, Norman Cousins described himself as being in state of euphoria over the next week as he continued to laugh himself back to health. Within a few weeks, he was back to work at the *Saturday Review*, and although he still had some minor physical difficulties, his body continued to recover as he continued with his self-directed healing program.

HOW DID THIS MIRACLE HAPPEN?

Norman Cousin's will to live ... his bravery to refuse the death sentence of his medical doctors ... as well as his determination to take charge of his own healing process by taking the time to research and find alternative ways to enable his wonderfully-made body to heal itself.

While in the hospital, he hypothesized that if negative emotions such as anger and frustration could contribute to *poor* health, why couldn't positive emotions such as joy and laughter have the *opposite* effect?! He soon embraced this idea, and his optimistic attitude turned his life around.

Norman Cousin's own doctor supported him in his efforts to heal himself without using medical treatments.

In spite of intense pain and discomfort, Norman Cousins made it a point of laughing so hard his stomach hurt during the early stages of his Marx Brothers' 'therapy,' and this "unquenchable" laughter never failed to produce a strong reduction in his feelings of pain.

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

IS YOUR HOME UPLIFTING?

by Joel Hilliker

A checklist of qualities to cultivate in day-to-day family life

"You always hurt the one you love," the old song says. In public, around strangers, we tend to be polite and gracious. But at home, we can easily let down, and be pore petty, crabby, critical. Is your home an uplifting place?

How do you talk to your family? Your mate, your children? How do they talk to you and to each other? Are your interactions laced with negativity, sarcasm, guilt trips, nettles and mean-spirited humor? Or are they positive, respectful, concerned for the other?

Want a go-to checklist you can fall back on when you feel like home life isn't quite right? Read 1 Corinthians 13:4-8. It tells us what God's love looks like *in action*. Measure your family life against this list. It shows you how to practice selfless love toward those closest to us.

"Love is patient and kind ..." (vs 4, RSV). That means being patient with each other's faults and weaknesses—which we are more aware of in our family mem-



bers than anyone else. Imagine if God were only as patient with your weaknesses as you are with your family's. "Kind" means performing kind acts—acting on your love, even in little ways.

"*Love is never rude*" (vs 5, Moffatt). Our manners, our etiquette, our standard of conduct—how we present ourselves to others, must never be rude. Extend these same courtesies not just to strangers or acquaintances, but also to your own family. During the dating and romance stage, both groom and bride-to-be put a 'best foot forward.' They are careful about manners, grooming, the courtesies. Then after marriage comes the 'let down.'

If you want a happy marriage, be far more particular about all such things *after* marriage than before. Be careful about your sleeping garments—be sure they are neat, clean, attractive to the other. Be careful about your hair—especially on rising in the morning. The very first thing I try to do on rising is to get a comb and brush, before my wife sees tousled and messed-up hair!

Ever notice how people answer the telephone? A wife calls her husband at his place of business or work. He answers: "Oh, it's you. Well I wish you wouldn't bother me now. I'm busy." But if some other woman might call on a matter of business, his voice is cheerful, courteous, warm, and friendly. And of course it's the same when the hubby calls the wife during the day. She's warmly cheerful and polite to all but him. She feels, 'Oh, he's only my husband.'

If you *must* be cross, discourteous, or appear tired before someone, let it be anyone else—but never your husband or your wife! Don't ever utter the alibi, 'Oh, but we're married, now.' Be lovers, as long as you live!

"*Love seeks not her own*" (vs 5). Moffatt says, "*Love is never selfish*," and the RSV says, "*Love does not insist on its own way*." This world needs more of this kind of love—a love that is never selfish. Not around your worst enemy, and not around your spouse. Within your family, strive to always meet the needs of your spouse and children before your own.

This is perhaps the most fundamental key to making family relationships work. If everyone is looking out for the other rather than themselves, there is plenty of overlap to meet everyone's needs and many of their wants. That's God's love! It's not, "I'll give you this if you give me that." It is never selfish. It's unconditional.

"*Love is not easily provoked*." If you are loving your family, you are never irritated. How easy to violate this principle! You're tired, stressed—something hits you the wrong way at the wrong time—and *BAM!* You lash out at someone—usually a loved one. Your spouse and your children are the ones who see you in your most trying moments. But God's love is never irritated. It finds a way to control itself, even under difficulty. God's love is not easily provoked—it is not too touchy or sensitive. Even if someone does wrong us in some way, God's love will let it go.

"*Love is always eager to believe the best, always hopeful, always patient*" (vs 7, Moffatt). We live in a negative world. But with this love, you still have a positive, hopeful outlook. You see people for their strengths and their potential—as God does. Even those in your family. You concentrate on what you admire in them. You recognize their

growth, their personal victories, their achievements.

The author Goethe said, "If you treat an individual as he is, he will stay as he is; but if you treat him as if he were what he ought to be and could be, he will become what he ought to be and could be." How true that is among our families! How much can you help your family grow by cultivating a positive attitude toward each member?

Everyone needs appropriate praise and appreciation. Especially our impressionable children. Sometimes we can get into a bad cycle of always seeing their mistakes. This can be a trap. When you see something praiseworthy, tell them so! You'll see them blossom like a flower receiving water.

Let's make our homes training grounds in putting God's love—the most positive force in the universe—into action, every day.

Courtesy The Philadelphia Trumpet, Box 3700 Edmond OK 73083

In this day of rising Muslim influence, do you know the:

DIFFERENCES BIBLE vs KORAN

Ben J. Smith

This book is a simple overview to answer some of the questions generated after Sept 11, 2001. Doctrinal disciplines of either the Bible or Koran are not discussed here. It is basically a dictionary of words or thoughts as quoted from verses of the Bible and the suras of the Koran. The author is a scholar of early religions as they relate to the original Hebrew and Greek manuscripts of the Bible.

#993 @ sug don \$37.85

SAM BLUMENFELD'S COUNTER-REVOLUTION

by Geoffrey Botkin

In 1993 my wife Victoria performed a counter-revolutionary act. She handed a well-worn, red spiral-bound book to our six-year-old daughter. Our daughter could not read, but that was precisely the point. The book was Sam Blumenfeld's work on phonetic English. After a few days of reading over the basic sounds and alphabetic code with her mother, our daughter concluded, "Well, that was easy; I can't see any reason why Ben couldn't do that." Ben was her four-year-old brother. Within a few days of being led through the book by his big sister, he too, was reading English. Today Ben has sons of

his own, and will shortly introduce them to the architecture of academic freedom, as presented so straightforwardly by Sam Blumenfeld.

How many twentieth-century thinkers will leave a positive legacy that will extend into the twenty-second? Sam Blumenfeld will. He was one of the first to recognize, back in the 1970s, the potential of the home education movement to return academic freedom and integrity to America. He also appreciated the stifling power of the public schooling cartel to keep families intimidated, ignorant, and confined to the system. He started providing simple tools to parents trying to escape forced government schooling. Some of Blumenfeld's most quoted books were short, punchy histories of public schooling. The books connected little-known policies from Jimmy Carter's federal offices of education backward to the seventeenth-century social engineers who knew exactly how the culture could be transformed into a socialist, anti-Christian, anti-academic leviathan. These revolutionary utopians planned to invert the culture through centralized control of education. And they were succeeding, because parents blindly delegated "education" to revolutionary schoolmarm who took care of the children. They learned to do this in school.

Education is Not Glorified Childcare

The dawning of the Reagan administration saw the nascent religious right scrambling for seats at the policy tables in Washington. They fancied themselves traversing the corridors of power, wrangling the big issues of the day onto the front page of *The Washington Post*. Busy and important with the "important issues" of the day, they put



up their dukes with Ted Kennedy staffers, groaned about Soviet puppets, argued with demonstrators on the Mall, convened working lunches, harped at Bennett Johnston, and positioned recruits for the next elections. But they refused to give any serious thought to education policy. What possible importance could child's play have on the future of a nation?

Every morning the powerful champions of this moralistic majority sent their children to the temples of political indoctrination, where these children were groomed to be willing allies of the rising amoral majority. The kids of the Religious Right were schooled every day by the Religious Left, and it was not child's play.

By the end of the century, the Religious Right had little to show for their power lunches and press conferences. Two prominent leaders admitted that the New Right had failed. They had conserved nothing of importance; they had changed nothing of significance in the corridors of power. While they were busy gaining Republican "momentum," they were losing the minds and hearts of their children.

Thanks to the government schoolroom's power to crush individuality and bring about mind-numbed conformity, leftism became the universal and dominant worldview at the precise moment that the Religious Right refused to take education seriously as a policy issue. Children of the right were easily subsumed into the statist culture. Duly ashamed of their heritage, they laundered their abused consciences by quietly supporting the destructive leftist policies of the 1990s. Their Southern Baptist mummies also conformed and voted for Bill Clinton—twice. The centralized worldview had taught everyone that *right* was now politically incorrect. Especially it was *religiously* right. We entered the new century suffering under pessimism, family tension, moral confusion, and academic stupidity.

Blumenfeld's Counter-Revolution

How had the Left so easily changed everything? Through the same religious revolution that had been proceeding apace since the early nineteenth century. Change a nation's religion, and you have changed the nation's culture. It is through centralized schooling that the convictions, theology, attitudes, and behaviours of entire cultures can be revolutionized.

Sam Blumenfeld knew this, but his voice was a lonely one in the 1980s. Yet his powerful counter-revolutionary ideas were completely understandable. He gave us blunt, historical reality. To those who would listen, he also provided workable, long-term solutions to the ongoing devastation of forced public schooling. One of his first reality-bombs showed us that public education was not part of our legacy of freedom, but a dangerous, recent import of European statist authoritarianism.

"The plain, unvarnished truth," he wrote, "is that public education is a shoddy, fraudulent piece of goods sold to the public at an astronomical price. It's time the consumer knew the extent of the fraud which is victimizing millions of children each year."¹

Government schooling was never a tradition of the Founders. It was not the institutionalization of boys that gave men like Sam Adams, Patrick Henry, and Daniel Webster their character, education, or wisdom. Public edu-

cation never belonged to parents, nor was it intended to. The teacher's oak desk in little Johnny's classroom may be old, but everything in the teacher's pedagogy was recently designed to make Johnny unfit for self-government, freedom, and moral heroism of any kind.

Public education was first forced on unwilling Boston parents as a completely unwanted compulsory law, passed in 1852, after parents had enjoyed two hundred years of educational freedom in that city. The forced collection of new taxes funded revolutionary teacher training centers.

Blumenfeld's work showed us that government-mandated schooling has never been Christian, nor academic, nor constitutional. There were plenty of his own warnings for contemporary parents, but he provided valuable *historic* warnings, like those of Herman Humphrey in 1820, who predicted that public education could give us a government that resembled an "iron despotism" or an "intoxicated anarchy."² And Humphrey has reason to be concerned. As early as 1816, Robert Owen formed the Institute for the Formation of Character, to deliver children from religious influence in Scotland. Owen took children away from parents he considered "victims"³ of a religious society and started a secular school that would be imitated worldwide, most notably in statist Prussia.

Owen stated, "Give me a colony of infants; I will suppress all erroneous reasoning and all false conclusions ... I will then so educate my children that they will grow up to despise those things which now they most value, and unite in a community of interest which will end in universal brotherly

love, and unity."⁴ Owen's son became an American congressman who pushed socialist infant education with great resolve, asking, "Who doubts the omnipotence of National Education?"⁵ "The religion of the world is the sole cause of all the disunion, hatred, uncharitableness, and crime, which pervade the population of the earth."⁶ Owen concluded that "public education was the first step on the road to socialism and this would require a sustained effort of propaganda and political activism over a long period of time."⁷

Blumenfeld also brought to light the strategic work of Orestes Brownson, who in 1829 co-founded a socialist political party that would stress public education as its main tool for altering our society. Brownson later revealed, "Our complete plan was to take the children from their parents at the age of twelve or eighteen months, to have them nourished, fed, clothed and trained in these schools at the public expense; but at any rate we were to have godless schools for all the children of the country. The plan has been successfully pursued ... and the whole action of the country on the subject has taken the direction we sought to give it."⁸

The Fight for Literacy and Free Thought

But perhaps Blumenfeld's greatest contribution was in the fight for national literacy. He documented John Dewey's anti-campaign of getting schools to replace the phonetic approach to reading with the "whole word" or "look-say" method. He then exposed Dewey's socialistic agenda. "True children of the future," said Dewey, "... (will be) more socialist than capitalist, more collectivist than individualist." "High literacy," he objected, "is an obstacle

New Video

LORD MONCKTON - Behind the Left's Push to Remove Tony Abbott (Feb 2015)[3:34]. Why the Left Overthrew Tony Abbott as PM, Sept 2015 [59:35]. Labor's Evil Plan for Australia - Agenda 21 Genocide Plan [50:59]. Australia: Everyone Must Get Vaccinated Except the Prime Minister's Daughters [7:20]. Australia Unleashes Massive Population Control Measures [24:24]. Why is this Doctor being silenced by the Aussie Vaccine Mafia? [13:05]. (just over 2-1/2 hours total). Shows nothing in politics happens by chance - it was all planned in a back room somewhere by powerful forces, and the extreme left-wing bias of the media.

#CI-1004 @ sug don \$8



to socialism.”

Blumenfeld records, “to Dewey, the greatest obstacle to socialism was the private mind that seeks knowledge in order to exercise its own private judgment and intellectual authority. High literacy gave the individual the means to seek knowledge independently.”¹⁰

Former teacher Albert Lynd noted that, “Many of Dewey’s educational disciples may be coy or confused, but the master himself is clear enough in his writings about the implications of his teaching. It excludes God, the soul, and all the props of traditional religion. It excludes the possibility of immutable truth, of fixed natural law, of permanent moral principles. It includes an attitude toward social reform which is ... socialist.”¹¹

R.J. Rushdoony summarized Dewey’s core belief: “A basic faith and presupposition in Dewey’s system is the state school as the new established church, the new vehicle of social salvation,” Rushdoony wrote. “Basic to this faith was Dewey’s radical reliance on stimulus-response psychology, so that the child received stimuli and responded, was essentially passive and consumption-centered rather than aggressive and capable of himself creating the stimuli and the social situation.”¹²

Not content with merely exposing John Dewey’s anti-phonetic approach to reading, Blumenfeld presented a real solution to the crippling illiteracy. He released his *Alpha-Phonics* program which was used by thousands who wanted to know how to read, including adult victims of government education.

Blumenfeld was a champion of freedom and understanding. He wanted children to be able to take command of their own learning adventures, creating both the stimuli and the actions that could change society. He was no mere whistle-blower. Blumenfeld countered the machinations of Dewey and others by leading a return to literacy, giving thousands of families—including my own—the practical tools to help their children master written language. Sam continued this fight until his last days. Thankfully, he lived long enough to see tens of thousands of children learn to love true academic freedom, and to see a new generation, free from institutionalization, pass on limitless educational opportunity to their own children.*

Geoffrey Botkin is the founder of The Western Conservatory of the Arts and Sciences.

Notes:

1. See, for example, Samuel Blumenfeld, “The Fraud of Education Reform,” *Journal of Christian Reconstruction* 11:2, (1986-87) pp.22ff. for elaboration of this thesis.

2. Samuel Blumenfeld, *Is Public Education Necessary?* (Boise, ID: The Paradigm Company, 1981), p.47.

3. p.40.

4. p.120.

5. p.102.

6. p.204.

7. Op. Cit., n.p.

8. p.96.

9. Samuel Blumenfeld, *The Victims of Dick and Jane* (Vallecito, CA: Chalcedon, 2003), p.230.

10. Samuel Blumenfeld, N.E.A.: *Trojan Horse in American Education* (Boise, ID: the Paradigm Company, 1984), pp.104-105.

11. Albert Lynd, *Quackery in the Public Schools* (Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Co., 1953), n.p.

12. Rousas John Rushdoony, *The Messianic Character of Ameri-*

can Education (Vallecito, CA: Ross House Books, 1963[1995]), p.154.
Courtesy Faith for all of Life, Box 158, Vallecito CA 95251

“SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE,” INSIDE THE CHURCH?

by Matthew Luckey

The goal of revolution, of moral disarmament then, was liberty, fraternity, and equality: liberty from God, fraternity in sin, equality of all moral, economic and religious distinctions. But the end was liberty from life, fraternity in death, and equality in hell.

--Rousas John Rushdoony, *Chacedon Report*, #32

What sentiment of the political mainstream is possibly more commonplace than that old secular chestnut “separation of church and state”? Have you ever stopped to consider the possibility that the general consciousness has been so utterly conditioned by the ideology of “separation of church and state” that this ideology has become standard operating procedure within the church itself? That we have separation of Christianity from church, of Christianity from professional churchianity?

The real decision-making authority in church no longer issues from the Word of God—what churches *do* is not determined by Scripture—but from secular management theory and market demand. The Evangelical and Fundamentalist churches have become like petit secular states, in which members/consumers are allowed to believe pretty much whatever they want so long as they keep it a private matter to themselves. The only thing unconditionally prohibited is Christianity interfering with church government and church business.

The true religion of Judeo-Christianity has finally revealed itself to be “separation of Christianity from the church.” This creed is the new orthodoxy while traditional Calvinist orthodoxy is marginalized and rendered irrelevant as a personal and therapeutic practice. In the secular state Jesus is banned from the office of authority so that government may represent Sikh, Muslim, atheist, Buddhist, and Christian equally. In the secular “free market” system, Jesus is also banned from office so that the shopkeepers may hawk their merchandise equally to Hindu, neo-pagan, santero, and Christian alike. And in Judeo-Christian churches Jesus is made an exile in His own kingdom government so that pastor-managers can attract the broadest consumer base of feminists, sodomites, idolaters, junkies, occultists, fornicators, as well as true Christians. Protestant churches have become pluralistic, multicultural, multi-religious, multi-racial and poly-sexual nests of Babel confusion. They try to be like shopping malls so pastor-managers can sell to the largest demographic; to have what anyone wants like a Kike peddling trinkets at a Moroccan bazaar.

I enter acme church on Sunday and shake hands with the all-purpose pastor-manager, who glad-hands and fixes his watery eyes on me. I say, “Pastor, I’m that ‘old-time religion’ kind of Christian. I want fire and brimstone preaching. I want a spade called a spade. Give me holiness and sold-outness to Jesus the Christ. Can this church deliver the goods?” Pastor-manager’s weak chin moves without altering the smile, “I’m with you brother. You’re going to feel real comfy here. We got a cell group customized for shop-..., er ... I mean, for Christians just like

New Video:

PEOPLE WHO CONTROL AMERICA Mind-Blowing Documentary 2015

This documentary reveals how all branches of the govt is run by corporations. This is the invisible government and people have no say which President they get. CFR controls both parties. There have been and still are false flag incidents and conspiracies. Someone creates an agenda and everyone must follow. War is a racket and is used to create as much fear and trauma as possible to bring in the New World Order and Gobal Governance.

#CI-1003 @ sug don \$8



us.”

I return to acme church on Wednesday evening and shake hands with a different one-size-fits-all pastor-manager. “Now brother,” I say, “I don’t want none of that hateful ‘fire and brimstone’ kind of Christianist. I’m the new ‘luvin’ type Christian. I want to hear how God’s going to be relevant to my life, how He’s going to give me financial success and success with the ladies, if you know what I mean?” Pastor-manager smiles ghoulishly at me like a Jew pedophile just offered a job as counsellor at a Christian summer camp. “I’m with you brother,” he says. “You’re going to feel right at home here at acme church. I got just the cell group for you.”

On the following Sunday I shake hands with a third pastor-manager and say, “I’m an atheist, communist, Jewish, transgendered, jihadist Satanist. Oh yeh, I’m also unrepentant. You got a place for me at this here church?” Pastor-manager smiles broadly, “I’m with you....”

Judeo-Christian churches are no respecter of persons today. They will embrace an active faggot debauch as much as a faithful Christian. We are all equal citizens under the dome of the mega-church franchise. This is exactly how Judeo-Christian pastor-managers want it. They dream of churches the size of cities, containing the entire population irrespective of race, religion, sex identity, etc. Pastor-managers really want to be mayor of a city or CEO of a multinational corporation. When they enter Christian ministry their first reflex is to remake Christianity in the image of what they really want: to be manager of a secular super organization. They don’t even like God. They got their wires crossed somewhere along the way and entered the wrong field. To the pastor-manager God is just another member of the organization to manage. He sets his authority as administrator higher than the office of God.

Man emancipates himself from religion by banishing it from the sphere of public law to that of private law. - - Karl Marx.

The Jew Marx understood full well the true purpose of economic and political liberalism, since it was his racial kinsmen who created it to destroy Christian civilization. What is important to understand about Marx’s words is that the goal of secular governance is not to emancipate men from other men through rights and freedoms. The true purpose concealed beneath this pretext is to emancipate men from the Ten Commandments. This is why the discourse of human rights always has the ring of sin’s rights, of the sinner’s politically enforced right to his own sin. Judeo-Christians, with their theology of “separation of church and state,” reduce God’s Law to the category of personal therapy while exalting the laws of the free market and secular state as absolute sovereign authority.

Picture a moment the most wishy-washy mega-church, seeker-sensitive church, or emergence church you or your friends may unfortunately have attended by mistake. The ministers typically spend most of their time behind the pulpit watering down Christianity and blurring Biblical distinctions. These pastors undermine the truth and authority of God’s Word in the name of God’s “love.” But ask yourself, are these ministers consistent on their own project of making authority relativistic, or do they swallow the camel while straining a gnat by subverting only one source of authority: the Bible? Do they challenge authority all the way down? You will find to the degree that these Judeo-Christian pastors are relativists when it comes to Biblical authority, they are hard-line fundamentalists when

it comes to their own authority as managers of secular business and administrative principles. They are inflexible absolutists when it comes to the profit motive and their position as religious entrepreneurs and bureaucrats. The degree to which Christianity is weakened corresponds to the degree to which the rule of Moloch is exalted. In an inversion of the New Testament these ministers follow the ethos, “Christ must decrease while I increase.” The pastor-manager doesn’t have a problem with all authority, just with any authority that competes with his own.

“Man,” as Marx states, “emancipates himself” from God’s Law, which prohibits him from doing what he wants to do: sin. *The Declaration of Independence* is a declaration of independence from the Ten Commandments, and the *Constitution of the United States* is a constitution of lawlessness erected in defiance against Jesus’ Law-order, legislating the sinner’s right to sin against God. The Founding Satanists drafted these Luciferian Illuminati Scriptures as an impeachment of God’s sovereign authority and as an enthroning of insurrectionist man as issuer of his own law (Democracy, Constitutional Republicanism, Political and financial Liberalism).

Wars are seldom about that which they are stated to be about. The American Revolution was as much about ejecting British rule as the War of Northern Aggression was about slavery. “When America was colonized, the settlers in every colony made Biblical Law their basic law. There was no tax on property: this was basic to Biblical liberty ...

Another transfer of funds was made to the Loeries in South Africa - they received just over 18,000 South African Rand. Acknowledgement of receipt was received from them. If you would like to contribute towards the next transfer, please do so before March 2016, Thanks for your help!

The South was the last area to accept property tax, and it was largely forced on the South by post-Civil War Reconstruction (Rushdoony: Chalcodon Report #24). Both wars were but pretexts to advance a secret Luciferian-Zionist agenda, requiring nullification of God’s Law so that property tax (tithe) might gradually be imposed, thereby making the secular state the country’s new god. The true purpose of the Revolution and War of Northern Aggression was to abolish the Bible as the governing Law of the land, which for the previous two centuries it had been.

America wasn’t born in 1776; it was murdered!

For this reason, the cry of every Calvinist, Dominionist, Anglo-Israel and Identity-Christian should echo the following:

What we need is to burn the Constitution and replace it with the Holy Bible. Then, and only then, will we see justice and peace and true happiness throughout the country. Then, and only then, will we see pedophiles and those who practice bestiality executed. Then, and only then, will we see segregation return. Then, and only then, will we see the Lord Jesus Christ exalted as He should be in our national life (Kemble’s Trumpet Blasts #44)

God is no doubt punishing this nation with an epidemic of sodomites, Negro-on-White race war, invasion of violent drug cartels and human traffickers, economic collapse, and universal political corruption; because by refusing to fight God’s enemies—and by “fight” I mean literally fight and not metaphorically for church business as usual—we have betrayed God. God is not judging the sodomites, Negroes, corrupt politicians, drug dealers, etc. God is judging us, the Christians! By failing to do what needs to be done we stand guilty of aiding and abetting the evildoers, of participating in their sins with them. They are God’s judgment on us.

In the Kingdom of God there is no trophy for “best try” or runner-up; and there exists no other people with a higher pay grade ready to step in and save us when we fail.

It’s just us! This is God’s design. If we fail, the whole thing is shot. The Kingdom is no fairy tale; It’s deadly serious business. We Calvinist, Dominionist, Anglo-Israel,



Identity-Christians have not overthrown the satanic political and economic system, yet still we are here and not fighting—with business as usual, giving and being given in (inter-racial) marriage, celebrating festivals and conferences, attending college or trade school, etc., etc.

Why?

How do we account for this disgraceful fact to Jesus? By our actions, or rather by our omission of action, we declare that we have come to terms with God's enemies. This makes us collaborators. If you do not fight with Jesus, then you fight against Him. Standing still while the battle rages is not an option.

Let's be clear about this one thing. God expects us to either crush the enemy or to die fighting. Living peacefully, even prospering, under anti-Christ rule is not one of the choices. Whether we win or lose our battles is irrelevant to God, because the outcome is His exclusive property and concern. What is important to God regarding us, and should be our primary concern, is the fight. From God's view—as the Bible reminds us repeatedly—if we just fight we have already won in terms of our duty. This is God's limit on us, to fulfill our duty. If God so pleased, He could wipe out all His enemies in the blink of an eye. The point is to place us here as God's race and representatives in the midst of our enemies to see if we will believe Jesus and fight, or betray Him instead. We should fight without even the idea of outcome in mind. We fight evil because it must be done regardless of the outcome. Though it is impossible, even if we knew the bad guys were to win the war, we would fight the battles none the less, because it is our nature to destroy evil regardless.

This is how it's supposed to be according to the boys who advocate secularism: "the secular" is the in-between space that separates the church from the government. It is supposed to be that space that protects the sanctity of the church walls from intrusion by the state. Secular management is the best way to run society, they tell us, because it makes private life and churches stronger.

However, of course, as experience has instructed us since 1776, that protective barrier separating church from state, and church from market demand, has proven non-existent. "The secular" tends to reproduce itself within the church walls, planting an internal space that separates Christianity from church. Secularism divides society in halves: the private sector and the public sector. This division plants itself inside the church so that it too is split between private and public, between Christianity and non-Christian management and marketing methods. Now, Christianity's dominion being half of what it once was, is divided again in half as the secular continues to expand and Christianity to recede, ad infinitum. The Communists used to always talk about the "withering away of the state" after the revolution. This is what the withering away of Christianity looks like under political and economic liberalism, but this revolution was not televised. Separation of church and state is not separation at all. It is banishment of the church within the church itself. It is banishment of Jesus and His Kingdom from the church.

Why on earth did Christians ever co-sign onto such a project in the first place? At best it reduces God to the role of unequal partner in society, and at worst it has effectively

expelled Jesus while retaining His name as the brand of a product for sale.*

Are you attending a church that condones women preachers, and sodomites in the pew or in the clergy? Then you had better "come out from among them, my people, that ye be not partakers of their sins, and that you receive not of their plagues. For their sins have reached unto heaven, and God has remembered their iniquities." (Rev. 18:4-5) because you give your acceptance by your presence.

COLD DEAD THINGS

by Michael Boldea, August 5, 2015

What makes us human? This is not so much a philosophical question as it is an introspective one. I ask this only because the actions of today's society and the notion of humanity itself seem to be at odds, and the more we get a peek behind the curtain, the more we realize we are becoming a planet of cold dead things, excusing and justifying practices that would make animals blush if they could.

Can we still call ourselves human when we are nonchalantly discussing the sale of baby parts as though we were ordering meat from our local butcher? Can we still call our-

selves human when what we claim to be a clump of cells is actually fingers, and toes, and arms, and hearts, and we still choose to murder them wholesale and profit from their death? Can we still call ourselves human when our ideal isn't saving lives but rather extracting babies from their mother's wombs in a more complete manner so as to resell their cadavers for more money?

When murder of the innocent becomes an issue of choice and the demand is 'murder at any time, for any reason, without apology,' how much if any of our humanity is still left?

A rotting soul walking around in a skin suit does not a human make, no matter how much lipstick and eyeliner you slather on it.

We like to use flowery words to cover up our criminality. We use words like reproductive rights, viable

tissue, or specimen, but we all know what we're really talking about here. We're talking about a human baby, one with eyes and ears and a nose, one which given the chance would have been born and lived and thrived, one which given the chance would have smiled and laughed and giggled.

We are talking about murdering said child because it's an inconvenience, then selling its remains as though it were a slab of meat. Yes, dignity indeed!

In classic Orwellian fashion, the individuals responsible for exposing the atrocities taking place in the murder mills across the nation have been ordered to keep silent by a court of law, because you can't mess with big business without getting your hand slapped, even if the product being peddled happens to be dead baby parts.

It's sort of like going to report on a rape, and being punished for being a tattletale. When did it become against the law to expose atrocity? When did it become criminal to defend the innocent and defenseless?

Throughout all of this unfolding, everyone was holding their collective breaths waiting for the church's reaction on

New LOAN ONLY video: BLUE - For Earth, For Humanity, For Freedom

For decades the Green Movement has claimed that Earth is threatened by the activity and even the existence of mankind. Green policies dictate that the noble response is relinquishing our liberties to "save" the planet from peril. This film challenges these Green philosophies, and explores issues like carbon emissions, climate change, over-population, natural resources, and unmasks the UN's Agenda 21 plan. BLUE casts a bold new vision; that through greater freedom we can realize a fuller potential for our fellow man and this beautiful blue planet we call home.

#CI-1005 @ sug LOAN don \$7



the matter. Some were even rubbing their hands in anticipation concluding that the church is taking so long to say something, because what it has to say is so powerful. Well, the people holding their breaths have since passed out due to lack of oxygen, and the church rolled over on its side, yawned once or twice, got a bit peeved for having its slumber interrupted and went right back to bed.

We are too busy—buying private jets, acquiring mansions, racing Bentleys, and telling everyone who will listen that Jesus wants to be their sugar daddy—to care about such trivial things as the murder of the unborn and the selling of their remains for profit. That's just beneath us. Our mission is to win the world, don't you know, and for that we need a brand spanking new jet to puddle around in.

But don't try taking the egg from a bird in the wild - because they are protected, and you will go to jail.

At this point, is anyone still praying to God to withhold judgment? I know I'm not!

DALLAS THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

by Ed Sommerville

Back in the twenties, the great Christian Industrialist, Henry Ford, after writing his four-volume book, *The International Jew* (single volume edition #309 @ \$26.95) said at that time there wasn't a Christian seminary in the country that had not been penetrated by the Zionists. I am sure that what you're about to read is not an isolated case, as these erroneous and new doctrines are taught in all the Fundamental and Evangelical churches today.

The following information was given to me by my son Dan who is a professor at Wheaton College. This was told to me about fifteen years ago and I have been able to remember it as it was told to me at that time.

Dan, while attending a church at Wheaton met a man that told him about what happened to him and two of his friends that attended Dallas at the same time. They all graduated and did not go into the ministry or Christian work. They all had separate careers and I think one of them became a dentist.

While they attended Dallas they all sat under a professor, Dr. John Walvoord (BA, DD, AM, ThB, ThM, ThD, LittD - promotor of the pre-trib Rapture teaching, author of over 30 books, 1910-2002, who headed the studies on eschatology and prophesy. Even after moving to different cities, they kept in touch with each other while studying the Bible and comparing notes and found out by themselves that what they had been told in Dallas was in conflict with the Scriptures.

As time went on it bothered them so much that they decided to go to Dallas and confront their former professor who was at that time, president of Dallas (Theo. Sem.). They then called him and he agreed to set a time and meet with them. They all flew into Dallas the day before to take the time to go over all their notes, ideas and the presentation.

The meeting started out well with them going over the years spent there. They then got into the reason they were there and they all had a chance to present their case. He said he listened very intently for almost two hours without interrupting them. They were very apprehensive to say the least in waiting for him to reply. They were all dumb-

founded and blind-sided when he leaned back in his plush chair, and with a smile on his face, said, **So now you know.**

This same deception exists in all the seminaries, as it becomes apparent by listening to the similarity of the doctrines preached by today's pastors. A few years ago I wrote a 20-page article regarding the similarity between the Freemasons and today's Christianity. There is a quotation in it that is very useful and fitting: *Most lodge leaders do not realize that they are deceiving their members, and it is a system that confuses, deceives and controls men, getting them to do things that they would not do if they understood them.* In the 20th Century, due to the Zionist influenced seminaries we have a very different Christianity than the one that founded this great nation. The new religion has stood by and watched our nation's rapid decline into another Sodom and Gomorrah with little concern from our clergy.

Everything good that happened to America started in the pulpits; And everything bad that's happened to America started in the pulpits.

Jeremiah had something to say to the prophets and that would apply to our pastors today: **"But if they had stood in my council, and had caused My people to hear MY words, then they should have turned them from their evil way, and from the evil of their doings."** (Jer. 23:22).

"Bring the whole tithe into the storehouse, so that there may be food in My house, and test Me now in this," says the LORD of hosts, "if I will not open for you the windows of heaven, and pour out for you a blessing until it overflows. Then I will rebuke the devourer for you, so that it may not destroy the fruits of the ground; nor will your vine in the field cast its grapes," says the LORD of hosts." Micah 3:10-11.



A LIGHTER SIDE OF LIFE

The bones in the body are two hundred or more,
But in sorting our people, we need only four.

—Wishbone People—

They hope for, they long for, they wish for and sigh.
They want things to come but aren't willing to try.

—Funnybone People—

They laugh, grin and giggle, smile, twinkle the eye,
If work is a joke, sure, they'll give it a try.

—Jawbone People—

They cold, jaw and sputter, they froth, rave and cry;
They're long on the talk but short on the try.

—Backbone People—

They strike from the shoulder, they never say die,
They're winners in life, for they know how to try.

Courtesy Thy Kingdom Come, Box 1478 Ferndale WA 98248

Let us all continue to live in this life God has given us in His presence and perspectives until death brings is all to God's glorious eternal works and bliss. Let us pray for continued protection of God's people in these times of major upheaval and invasion. It seems over the next 12 months many major things are about to happen.

Blessings to you and thank you for your continued support and prayers for this ministry. May the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob bless you and keep you safe, and make His face shine on you and give you His peace,

