

OBJECTIONS ABOUT ISRAEL

BEING EXCLUSIVE – SOME ANSWERS.

Arnold Kennedy

<aekennedy@xtra.co.nz>

There are two opposing views that colour almost everyone's views of things like education, politics, philosophy, law, racism and religion. These two views are essentially Nationalism and Internationalism. The latter view includes the "Brotherhood of Man" idea that pre-supposes all people are brothers who are the same in God's sight, in all ways. This idea is taught to children at Sunday school in the words, "*Red and Yellow, Black and White, all are precious in His sight, Jesus loves the little children of the world*".

Because this idea is the standard teaching of churches, it is almost universally accepted. Not only is this the teaching of the churches, it is the dogma of World Government, Socialism and the New Age. Thus people are being pre-conditioned to think one thing from four ideologies, each of which oppose the Law of God. It is very hard for a pre-conditioned person to come to think differently from their long-held beliefs, especially when they are hammered with it from every side. But, for the few who do stop to think about the Bible, they come to see that it is about the one chosen people of Israel, as descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob/Israel, and that other peoples are mentioned only as they have a connection with Israel. Thinkers will quickly see that the promises and covenants made by God to Israel could not possibly be fulfilled in any different peoples. Paul does confirm in whom these promises are fulfilled in Acts 13:32-33, "*And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children*". There is absolutely no valid evidence of any later change from "their children" in what is commonly called the New Testament Age.

Through the New Testament there are many topics and words that originate in the Old Testament. In the Old Testament there are words such as "promises", "know", "elect", "called", "chosen", "seed" and variations of them which are generally agreed to refer only to the Israel nation. We have to ask if there is adequate reason to suggest a switch that might allow the equivalent Greek words to apply to some multi-racial church in the New Testament. Churches have had to dream up doctrines and interpretations to circumnavigate these things, and people accept these doctrines because they have been pre-conditioned to do so. When presented with anything different, they have varying reactions, and we will systematically look at the most common of these.

To use words like deception and another Gospel cannot be done lightly. These are very serious considerations and if the weight of biblical evidence is accepted, then the popular teachings must have cultist elements. The implications of this conclusion are vast and almost devastating to many Christians and churches. It has bearing on missionary activity as well. But, please note well, it has not been said or suggested that all the non-Israel nations should not be made subject to the Law of God. Neither has it been said that they are condemned by God. When we come to the interpretation of "*God so loved the world*" as taught, traditionalists have try to immediately get around every reference to the exclusiveness of Israel (in both Testaments). They do this to try to change the nation of Israel into some multi-racial church, or otherwise they want to say there are both a national Israel and a Church consisting of non-Israelites, despite the obvious contradiction. So they are operating outside of the given foundation of the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets, and thus must be wrong.

God has told us that He will do nothing He does not reveal first to his servants, the prophets of Israel. He will fulfil His Word to Israel. Any mention of the exclusiveness of Israel will cause immediate (and common) reactions among Christians who think they know their Bible. Now we can have a look at some of these common reactions. Only brief comments are made on these reactions, because they are all expanded at various places elsewhere in "*The Exclusiveness of Israel*" by this author.

REACTION ONE [THE MOST COMMON].

“Yes, that is true, but God was speaking to them, and not to us. Now God is speaking to everyone”.

This would be the thought of the majority of church-going people today, especially those who have no idea of their Anglo-Saxon/Celtic/Israel identity; something that is shown clearly through the old Church of England prayer book. So should we go along with that reaction just because it sounds right? As soon as it is asked, “*When in this church age did God’s speaking change from ‘them’ to ‘everyone’?*”, there is no answer at all. If this question cannot be answered from Scripture, then it has no basis.

It would be profitable for any who would like to retain this particular thought and reaction, to look at the root word “*grapho*” that is used in the New Testament 194 times. It would be profitable too, to look at “written” in a concordance where it will be seen afresh that many times the basis of all doctrine is “*it is written*”. “*It is written*” means “written in the Old Testament” and so these New Testament quotes also are addressed to Israelites.

If the basis of a belief or doctrine appears to be in the New Testament alone, it must be suspect because it is not written in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets. This is important because there are a number of such ideas that are generally accepted, but which do not have *it is written* as a basis. In fact it might be said that much of what is debated has no foundation at all in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets. Some traditional teachings cannot present a clear pattern of simple direct statements from the Old Testament to support these views. They rely mainly on fabricated “types”, “shadows” and analogies. Man’s tradition therefore is not established *in the mouth of two or three witnesses* as is required by Scripture. The word “Israel” cannot be changed to mean “non-Israel” just by making such a statement without having a foundation.

If a New Testament book, written in the ‘Christian age’, [for example, James’ Epistle to the Twelve Tribes] was written and addressed to Israelites, then either the writer was wrong or there would need to have been something that happened since Pentecost in order for men to be able to say, *God is now speaking to everyone* [meaning every race]. There has been no such happening.

REACTION TWO

“Yes, but Israel has now become the church, so all these things belong to the church”.

This would say that “Israel” and “The Church” no longer have any connection and that Israel has vanished. The church is supposed to consist of non-Israelites, the so-called “Gentiles”. However, the Hebrew words “*goi*” and “*goyim*”, upon which the “Gentiles” thought is based, is also used of Israel. So “*goi*” does not always equate with so-called non-Israel “Gentiles”. The whole subject is simplified when we accept what we find, and when we build upon the right foundation and have the Cornerstone.

Eph 2:20 And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and the prophets.

The Cornerstone and this foundation all agree. Since “apostles” is put before “prophets”, this Scripture is used to say that New Testament apostles have new prophecy and doctrine that was not contained or forecast within the Old Testament. Just to say something like that does not make it fact. In the books of Galatians and Romans in particular, modern teaching says that the Apostle Paul has made a turn around from what is recorded in Acts where Paul tells King Agrippa that he spoke nothing other than what was said in the law and the prophets! In the books of Romans and Galatians Paul is now supposed to be writing to certain so-called Gentiles who are supposed to be non-Israelites. The internal statements show that each letter in the New Testament is written only to Israelites. This is discussed in more detail in “*That Unfortunate Word ‘Gentile’*”, a chapter of the writer’s book, “*The Exclusiveness of Israel*”.

Let us look again at the Apostle Paul’s famous speech in Acts 13 which was made long after Jesus’ death and resurrection. Here, right in the New Testament age, Israel is still a genetic term. There is still no sign of “The Church” as this is commonly perceived. Consider all the following highlighted words from Acts 13:17-42:

- v17 *The God of this **people of Israel** chose our fathers,*
v23 *Of this man's seed hath God, according to his promise, raised **unto Israel** a Saviour, Jesus.*
- v24 *... the baptism of repentance to **all the people of Israel.***
v26 *Men and brethren, children of **the stock of Abraham.***
v32,3 *..how that the promise which was made **unto the fathers,** God hath fulfilled the same unto **us their children,***
v39 *And by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which **ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.***

In verses 24 and 39 we see the word "all" that most people like to generalise to include everyone on Earth. But the "ye", and the context, nails it down to Israel alone as they are the ones to whom the Law of Moses was given. All the highlighted words in these verses give a very specific definition of who is being addressed in the New Testament; it is always to a genetic Israel! We can no longer say that these children of the fathers, (Abraham, Isaac and Jacob), come from other stock. These are the people who had been under the Law of Moses! In the above passage, Paul was addressing those whom he described as **MEN OF ISRAEL**, who feared God. "The Church" has not replaced Israel, and is formed out of Israel only.

REACTION THREE

"The Gentiles are now adopted into Israel, so the promises made to Israel are now made to everyone who believes in Jesus".

A short answer to this reaction is not possible because there are so many aspects to cover. These are covered as individual sections on "gentiles", "the church", "strangers" and "adoption", and the promises made to Abraham and his seed, in "*The Exclusiveness of Israel*". As mentioned above, the words translated as "Gentiles" in both Hebrew and Greek are also used of Israel. This can quickly and simply be verified by looking at a Young's Concordance. Thus, in regard to the word "Gentiles", Bible dictionaries are wrong.

REACTION FOUR.

"It is said that the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile has been broken down so that all are now one in Christ."

Here we have another hinge-point of much of what is taught in the evangelical churches today. But, in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets, the partition is found to be between The House of Israel and The House of Judah. It is not between Israelites and non-Israelites [see Isaiah 11:13 "*Ephraim shall not vex Judah any more*"]. It can be shown that the House of Israel was punished by being "scattered" among the nations, and that any pattern showing a gathering or the joining together of Israel with non-Israel races cannot be found in prophecy. What is found frequently in Scripture is the joining of the House of Israel with the House of Judah. The divorced House of Israel is grafted back into the undivorced House of Judah –[Romans 11:17-24]. Only an Olive tree of one kind can be grafted back into another Olive tree. Note what the word "back" infers; they were together once before, prior to Israel being divided into two kingdoms.

REACTION FIVE.

"The seed of Abraham has now become the seed of Jesus ... it is now a spiritual seed".

The promises were made to Abraham's seed, but not to Jesus, who came to fulfil them. This seed is named, "in Isaac" –[Gen 21:12]. The promises were therefore given to the Israel people as a whole. Now, as Jesus was born into Israel, He is regarded as the seed of Abraham and of David [Matt 1:1]. But the promises were not specifically given to Jesus as the 'one seed' of Galatians 3:16. And, of course, Jesus had no 'seed'. The word "seed" is always used in the physical sense in Hebrew and Greek as a collective noun. If Jesus were that one seed, then everyone between Abraham and Jesus would be disinherited, including Isaac and Jacob. Israel then, could not have existed as the seed of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob, if Jesus were that seed. A more accurate translation of Gal 3:16 reads:

And to Abraham and the seed of him the promises were spoken. He says not, 'And to the seed of thee' as of many, but as of one. And to the seed of thee which is anointed.

It is the seed of Abraham that is anointed [christ] here, just the same as in the Old Testament, which also talks about "*the holy seed*". These were conceived that way.

REACTION SIX.

"The Jews are God's natural children, but the members of the Church are God's spiritual children".

Two sets of parallel prophecies cannot be found in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets, that is, there is not one set of promises to "natural" children and another to "spiritual" children. Therefore there cannot be any New Testament change. Neither is the promise made to Abraham's seed directed specifically to Jesus. The promises made to the fathers are always presented as being fulfilled in "*us their children*". Israelites are the children of the promise. There is only one promise in this respect. There is not any second similar promise found for non-Israel races.

NOTE: The "children" still have to be redeemed individually from the curse of the broken Law. They are "begotten from above" at conception as heirs of salvation.

This sixth reaction results from attempting to get around the problem of a national and racial Israel and retaining tradition at the same time. The word "Jew" has to be made to equate with Israel and the word "Gentile" has to be made to equate with non-Israel. This is not the world of reality! Yet it has been drummed into most Christians, conditioning all their thinking, teaching and writing, on almost every subject. "The Jews" are not spoken by Jesus as being God's children ever. Jesus said they originated "from below" and that the Devil was their father. Please view John chapter eight about this. Jewish Encyclopaedia claim the modern Jews descend from Esau, and if so they could not be of the promised seed through Isaac. See Genesis 21:12, Romans 9:7 and Hebrews 11:18, "*for in Isaac shall thy seed be called*". This confirms what was said in Reaction Four, about "seed".

REACTION SEVEN.

"That seems to be true, but no one knows who is an Israelite today."

May we quote 2 Timothy 2:19? "*Never-the-less the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are his*". There is a holy [separate] people which are called in the Bible, "*stone*", "*elect*", "*precious*", "*above all other people*", and "*which have now obtained mercy*". They are *brethren* from the womb and are anointed [*christos*]. They are born from above (that is, *begotten from above*). The Bible does give marks of identification that are clear and unmistakable, but this identity factor is outside the scope of this booklet. One thing certain is that God promised David that Israel would remain a kingdom as long as the sun and moon shine. So Israel is found today amongst people who are subject to a monarchy. There are very few options as to who this people could be. The Bible does give many other marks of identification. The old divines of the Church of England and Scotland believed these, and most Kings of England believed they were Kings of Israel.

REACTION EIGHT.

"This is all very well, but now everything is spiritualised."

It is unfortunate for such a belief that the Twelve Tribes of Israel keep appearing in the New Testament. So do the names Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Israel and "The Fathers". In this present New Testament age they are not spiritualised away! To react this way is to say that Jesus and Paul are wrong. Paul said "*unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come*" - Acts 26:7. How could twelve individual tribes with differing destinies and prophecies be spiritualised into a singular "church"?

REACTION NINE.

"The law has been fulfilled, therefore nothing in the law applies any more."

Jesus says in Matthew 5:17-18: "*Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.*"

The Law has different aspects. There is Mosaic Law and Levitical Law which are not the same thing, for instance. In Romans 13:8-10 we have a discourse about fulfilling the Law, which

concludes with, “*therefore love, is the fulfilling of the Law.* This Scripture is sometimes quoted as proof that everything relating to the Law is finished, but verse 8 is about people, as individuals, fulfilling the Law by their actions. It is not about God fulfilling His covenants and promises. This is confirmed in Matthew 7:12 where Jesus is saying, “*therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do YE also unto them, for this is the Law and the Prophets*”. Jesus has fulfilled what is written in the Law concerning Himself [Luke 24:44]. His sacrifice has fulfilled that part of the Law concerning sacrifices.

Possibly the short answer to the rest of the matter of fulfilling the Law is that heaven and earth has not yet passed away. When they are passed away, all will have been fulfilled. What has been written in the Law, The Psalms and The Prophets, will come to pass. The promises to the seed of Abraham still stand and will yet come to pass!

REACTION TEN.

“Everyone is now the same because all are one in Christ Jesus.”

This epitomises the traditional teachings. Verses typically used are:

Gal 3:7 Know ye therefore that they which be of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.

Gal 3:26 For ye are all children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

Gal 3:28 There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.

Gal 5:6 For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love.

Gal 6:15 For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.

It sounds right at first glance, particularly when the pronouns are ignored. The “ye” are the people being addressed. That is why it is necessary to establish that the so-called Gentiles in the Epistles were Israelites. “*The Exclusiveness of Israel*” devotes a chapter to this subject. There is no pattern through The Law, The Psalms and The Prophets to support tradition. It is not there, so something must be wrong with the traditional teaching. In both Hebrew and Greek, the word translated “all” here means “all of the context only”, not “all of everything else”. The same applies to words like “whosoever” and “every”.

Those taking the “every race” view indicate that God only deals in spiritual matters, putting a false application upon the phrase “*ye all are one*”, extending the meaning beyond those people of the context. Modern versions make blatant false additions to bolster the all-races view. These additions are ignoring the realities of man’s temporal life, and deny the physical nature of, “*The promises made to the fathers (of Israel) are fulfilled in us their children*”. God bound Himself by an oath to keep His covenant promises, and we dare not call God a liar in this.

In teaching such lies, Churches make the statement that “*neither Jew nor Greek*” or that “*Jew and Gentile*” means all races, without giving any proof of this. Even a quick reading of 1 Corinthians 10:1-4 tell us that these Corinthian “Gentiles” could be nothing else but Israelites.

Why would Paul say there were no longer Jews and Greeks when they still existed at that time? As “*Jew and Greek*” means the two houses of Israel, then, “*ye all are one*” refers only to members of these two Houses. What Churches have done is to try to change the identities of “*Jew and Greek*” to try to make it mean all races, but we read, “*For the LORD will not cast off his people, neither will he forsake his inheritance*”-(Ps 94:14), that is, Israel as a whole remains a separated people.

Going on about this verse, there still were obviously bond and free people, and there were and still are, males and females. That males and females still exist disallows the church use of “*no longer*”, so something must be wrong with the interpretation of these passages. Why would Paul teach about the differing functions of men and women if there were no difference between them?

Why would Paul talk about marriage? If there were no longer masters and servants, why ever would Paul teach about the relationships between them?

Regarding the Circumcision and the Uncircumcision, these are Israelite/racial terms in the same way, "Jew and Greek" are. In regard to salvation, male and female, servants and masters, members of these two nations mentioned, all are equally treated.

The words "*in Christ Jesus*" have a different meaning to "*in Jesus Christ*", the former being shown elsewhere to mean, "*in an anointed people belonging to Jesus*".

REACTION ELEVEN.

"It makes no difference now because all nations are blessed in Abraham. All is now of Grace."

Some teachers actually do say this, believe it or not. Now, if this were true, it means that the Old Testament is invalid. It is like the Roman Catholic idea of saying that the Church is the authority rather than the Bible and yet quoting the Bible wrongly about Peter and the rock (which incidentally is a feminine word) to support their view. But to whom is God gracious if all is of grace? Is it every one of every race on Earth? Both Testaments deny this in their "Brotherhood of Man" concept.

Exodus 33:19 .. *and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will shew mercy on whom I will shew mercy.*

Rom 9:15-18 *For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, so then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy ... therefore hath he mercy upon whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.*

It is God who does the choosing, not man. This question of the Grace of God is a subject in itself; but the over-riding principle is the Sovereignty of God. It is "*whom He will*".. To say glibly, "all is of grace" is to include everyone and to make a mockery of the Sovereignty of God. If redemption is for every man of every race, then the whole choice is man's choice and this is "*another gospel*" -[2 Cor 11:6 and Gal 1:6].

In the New Testament, "grace" refers to the Divine influence upon the heart. We can find no reference to God writing the Law on their hearts other than to Israel, nor can we find a word of prophecy about a new heart being given to any other than racial Israelites.

STUMBLING BLOCKS TO AN EXCLUSIVE ISRAEL

Earlier we looked at the general reactions which immediately spring to mind when the consistent pattern of Scripture about *The Exclusiveness Of Israel* is introduced to people. It is time now to look at the stumbling blocks that modern teaching put in our way. It is appreciated that people's objections and concerns are very genuine and that such people are usually sincere. It is also recognised that it is difficult for people to "unlearn" what they have been taught for years. It is necessary to look at a selection of stumbling blocks that would represent most of those that are raised.

1. IT IS CONTRARY TO THE NATURE OF GOD

This is a sincere feeling that many have, but it has its origin in an unbalanced view of the character of God. Where there is continual emphasis on the Love of God and almost total neglect of the Righteous Judgements of God, this is understandable. The universalising of "all" and "every" beyond each context, together with the absence of teaching about the sovereignty of God, are the root cause of this feeling. In His nature, God is unchanging. That God should create vessels for different purposes is not readily acceptable to many people, but it is the clear teaching of Scripture. For example:

1. It is God who put the perpetual enmity between *the seed of the serpent* and *the seed of the woman* [Gen 3:15].
2. It was The Lord who put a mark upon Cain and his offspring [Gen 4:15].

3. It was God who saved Noah and his family because Noah was (genetically) *perfect in his generations* [Gen 6:9].
4. God gave different destinies for Noah's sons Ham, Shem and Japheth.
5. God even placed different "last days" destinies on each of the 12 Twelve tribes of Israel [Gen 49 and Deut 33].
6. We find scriptural discrimination between "men" as *enowish* or *adam*, etc.
7. We find words for "men" that do not apply to women in both Hebrew and Greek (*iysh* and *aner*).
8. "*Jacob have I loved and Esau have I hated*" [Malachi 1:2,3 and Rom 9:13]. God's hatred for Edom is for "all generations" so they could not be part of that "world" that God "so loved".
9. God chose Israel and said *they should not be reckoned among the nations* -[Num 23:9] and *the God of this people Israel chose our fathers* [Acts 13:17]-exclusively!
10. *And she shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call His name Jesus, for he shall save His people from their sins* [Matt 1:21]. They were and are God's people before they are saved.

2. "OF EVERY KINDRED, TONGUE, PEOPLE AND NATION".

Rev 5:9,10 For thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on earth.

Rev 7:9 I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne

NOTE: Attention is drawn to "out of" in the first verse and "of" in the second verse. Both are the same Greek preposition "ek" with a literal meaning showing it does not mean "all of every nation, peoples etc. on earth" but a people taken 'out of' them and not 'of' them. These two passages appear to stand out against what has been presented so far, at first glance. It looks conclusive as a statement to say that before the Throne of God will stand people from every race on earth. This appearance is used as a basis for the teaching about universal racial salvation. Because this does not fit with any foundation in the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets, these verses require closer examination. Firstly, we must look at what this verse is fulfilling. We must ask if there is any stream of prophecy confirming the popular multi-racial view. If there is none, then the original prophecies must stand.

Exodus 19:5,6... ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine, and ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation.

NOTE: In the Hebrew all people is plural with the article giving the meaning "all the peoples".

These verses are addressed only to Israel, as are a multitude of other Old Testament prophecies.

The Apostle Peter tells us about the same singular, peculiar people also, showing confirmation of the Old Testament in the New Testament.

1 Peter 2:9 But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people.

It must be registered that national terms may not be racial. And it must be remembered that Israel had twelve tribes that became scattered among other nations and peoples. Their languages became those spoken by their captors and later those of the nations amongst whom they were dispersed or scattered. This is from whence the people of Israel were re-gathered. They were from among every tribe, tongue, people and nation, as was prophesied. It is repeated again that there is no prophecy about all races being in the Kingdom of Heaven, or of any race being redeemed other than Israel. Others had no broken Law-covenant that required redemption. But Israel is redeemed "out of", [not "of"] every kindred, tongue and nation and people. Most of the prophetic books speak consistently about the re-gathering of the House of Israel and the House of Judah. There is nothing about the modern concept of this being "Jews and Gentiles". Both still have to be Israelites.

Quoting R.K. Phillips in *Incontrovertible Facts Of The Bible*, we find:

This 'Holy Nation' was to be the next step in the re-establishment of the Sovereignty of the Kingdom of God on the Earth. This Sovereignty of God denotes a sphere of God's rule and requires that:

1. *It has a territory;*
2. *It has a people;*
3. *It has laws;*
4. *It has a King;*
5. *It has an economy;*
6. *It has an administration*

All these things God was now about to give to the Children of Israel and at Sinai the people accepted God as their King, thus making them a holy nation. God has never rejected that Sovereignty over that throne or that nation.

If every race was included then this would all be meaningless. A number of commentaries refer to the redemption as that of the people who had once been redeemed from Egypt. The Exodus is the first place where there is mention of redemption [Exodus 15:13]. The redemption in Scripture is always that of Israel, and of Israel only.

Bullinger's Lexicon comments:

But now the People had been scattered among every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation and therefore they must be redeemed from out of these the second time, like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up, out of the land of Egypt.

Isaiah 11:11 And it shall come to pass in that day that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people from Assyria,.... and from the islands of the sea.

The re-gathering is always of His People and not of other races. Contrary prophecy does not exist!

The scene of Rev 5:9 is in heaven as it is in Rev 7:9. Here there is a great multitude "out of" all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues. It does not say people "of" all races; the word *genos* (races) is not used in this passage.

It may not be appreciated that Israel is spoken of as "the families of Israel", the Tribes becoming nations.

Jer 31:1 At the same time, saith the Lord, I will be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people.

3. "ALL THE ENDS OF THE EARTH"

Isaiah 45:22 Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth.

The word translated as the earth is the Hebrew word "eretz" which is mostly translated as "country" or "earth" in the sense of a localised area, or that earth belonging to a people [for example, the land, (or earth), of Israel]. In context, this whole chapter is about Israel and no other. It certainly is not used in the generalised sense as the universalists who try to prove the expression "the ends of the earth" means every race or place on Earth. A quick look at the word "ends" in Hebrew and Greek will dispel this idea as it fixed by grammar to refer to time, not place.

4. THE EXODUS

When Israel made the Exodus from Egypt, it is evident that some Egyptians, or some of mixed blood, came out with the Israelites. The claim has been made that these saw the miracles that God had done in the Land of Egypt, and so they joined themselves to Israel. These are then wrongly said to be "a type of non-Israelite Gentiles joining the church". This mixed multitude was continually a problem within Israel. It should be remembered that these were not permitted to assemble with Israel, before God, because they were not Israelites. There are two expressions translated, "The congregation of the Lord", namely the *edah* of Israel and the *cahal* of Israel, and this difference is important because they separate the mixed multitude travelling through the wilderness from the Israelites themselves.

5. "EVERYONE THAT THIRSTETH"

Isaiah 55:1 Ho, everyone that thirsteth, come ye to the waters ...

The context shows this is addressed to Israel alone. The sure mercies of David [v3] indicate the people of whom He is commander. Concordances do not convey the meaning of this

word “everyone” (*kole*), but there is a parallel where the Greek equivalent is considered in the next objection.

6. CORNELIUS

This man is used by many as an example of a so-called “Gentile” non-Israelite being saved. The place of birth, or citizenship (“Roman”) tells us nothing about race. But this man’s race can be determined by Scripture, even if he is not described as a “Jew” [or “Judean”]. In the AV of Acts 10:28, Cornelius is described as being of “*another nation*” but, the Greek text uses the word *alophulos* which is a compound of *allos* [another of the same kind], and *phulos* [a kindred tribe (phule)]. Note that *phule* = tribe does not equate with *ethnos* = race.

Cornelius was a devout man, we are told, and he feared [the] God, therefore he was one who could believe. According to Vine, devout means “*careful as to the presence and claims of God*”. So Cornelius knew the Old Testament claims of God upon Israel. We do not find devout being used of people other than Israelites. Also, he feared “God” [Acts 10:2] and he prayed to [the] God and was heard by [the] God. “God” here is *ho theos*, the term used to denote the one true God. So, Cornelius was not a Roman polytheist! He was an Israelite!

7. PETER’S SHEET VISION

Universalists use the account of Peter’s sheet vision to suggest that the unclean animals in the sheet represent peoples of all races, but the rest of the chapter shows otherwise. That they are called “Gentiles” by translators in verse 45 only confirms that the wrong meaning that is put on this word *Gentile*. Historically, the House of Israel, which was scattered among the nations, was considered unclean and common by those practising the Jewish (Edomite, Tradition of the Elders) religion. In saying that it was unlawful, Peter knew that what he was doing was contrary to the Tradition of the Elders in Judea. As will be shown later, Peter was being shown that the ten Tribes of The House of Israel would be cleansed under the New Testament. The animals in the sheet represented the unclean and uncircumcised members of the House of Israel.

This vision in Acts 10 is also used to promote the idea that the prohibition against eating certain unclean meats is no longer valid. The symbol is taken literally! When Peter declares what God has shown him, God does not tell him that he should eat unclean meats, but that, God has showed me “*that I should not call any man common or unclean*”. The word another in another nation [v28] has already been covered above to show that this refers to people of the same kind. “Nation” here is *phulos* and not *ethnos* or *demos* which are often translated as “nation” and “people”. The distinction is noted by Vine under “nation” and refers to *allos* (another), and *phulon* (a tribe).

*Acts 10:36 The Word which God sent unto the **children of Israel**, preaching (proclaiming) peace by Jesus Christ*

Note the limitation as to whom “The Word” was sent. This verse follows on to say that a start was made in the Holy Land and continued to the uncircumcised Grecians of the House of Israel [Acts 11:20]. This fulfilled the Word as being sent to all Israel, both Circumcision and Uncircumcision. In verse 35 we have “*every nation*” that, as the next verse explains, are the nations of Israel [the former tribes of Israel which were dispersed among all the other nations]. This confirms what the Old Testament says about the Law and God’s word being given only to Israel. Israel was scattered among “*every nation*” [v35], and the Word [*logos*] was sent to Israel specifically, according to this verse. The Word of God was sent to Cornelius, as an Israelite. The “*in every nation*” of verse 35 is commonly and incorrectly given the general meaning of “every” as being “every race”, despite the fact that in both Hebrew and Greek, “every” is confined to the context people only. Cornelius was one of those who feared and believed God. He had that spiritual capacity within him from his conception. These men had the capacity to believe God and so could accept the ‘good news’ and become reinstated as God’s people. “All men” is thus all the men of dispersed Israel and all the men of the Judean nation who were of Israel.

Acts 10:43 To Him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.

The prophets did not witness or prophesy of redemption and remission of sins for all races. Evidently it is thought that they should have, according to the common popular doctrine. The prophets were giving witness about Jesus and Israel [v43].

8. THE ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH.

Here we have a man who went to Jerusalem to worship, and was returning and reading the Scriptures in his chariot. It impossible for a non-Israelite to be returning from an Israelite feast. Although he was "of Ethiopia", this says nothing about his race or genes; it only tells us where he was living. If he had been a black man, he would not have been allowed near the temple, as he would have been an alien. The Jews would have killed such a person immediately. We can see a similar thing when the Apostle Paul tried to take one who was suspected of not being an Israelite into the temple [Acts 8:21]. Would Phillip be sent to one who was not called by God and to one who "could not" receive the Word? The weight of this passage says the Ethiopian was an Israelite, even if his residence was in Ethiopia.

9. THE WIDOW OF SAREPTA

Again, there is nothing conclusive to say the widow was not an Israelite in this passage [Luke 4:24-28]. The principle is no different to that given in Matthew 13:57 where Jesus did few mighty works in His hometown. There are however two points that should be noted:

1. The widow woman obviously knew that Elijah was a man of God, and she knew about sin and therefore the Law which was given only to Israel [1 Kings 17:18].
2. Elijah was a prophet of Israel sent to Israel and he said to the woman, "Thus saith the Lord God OF ISRAEL".

10. "WHOSOEVER SHALL CONFESS ME"

Luke 12:8 And I say unto you, Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of man also confess before the angels of God.

The "you" Jesus is addressing is not the multitudes, but the disciples only. The word "men" is one of many Greek words translated as "men". There are differing kinds of "men" and different words for "men," in the original languages. Men may have differing origins and be of differing seeds and plantings. To deny this is to deny Jesus' words. To deny and to teach differently is to deny Me before men. These things are not being taught today because they do not fit in with the "all" of the "all the world" universal doctrine.

11. THE WOMAN OF SAMARIA

This passage in John 4:12 is easily satisfied in the words, *Art thou greater than OUR FATHER JACOB who gave us this well.* She was a descendant of Jacob and thus was an Israelite. How anyone can use her place of residence to say she was a non-Israelite is hard to comprehend. Samaria contained a mixture of races. In Acts 8:14 we can see that certain of the Samaritans received the Word of God. In the first verse we find evidence of the scattering abroad to Samaria. Philip proclaimed the Word in Samaria as did Peter and John. Their proclamation to Israel was concerned with the Kingdom of God.

12. "EVERYONE THAT ASKS RECEIVES"

Luke 11:10 For everyone that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.

In the New Testament there are many places where we find words translated as "all", "everyone", "whosoever", "every", etc. In the Greek the situation is similar to that already pointed out to be the case in the Hebrew. We could take the meanings of these words as either:

- [a] All of everything, or
- [b] All of that part being spoken about.

We are not at liberty to choose which meaning suits us to prove a doctrinal position, but this is what most do. Usually it is done in ignorance or without thought because of the traditional teachings. We cannot mis-apply these words to suit ourselves. We can read the Scriptures from the viewpoint of generalisation or from differentiation, but both cannot be right at the same time. It is always necessary to take note to whom any passage is addressed. This defines the context of

the passage. If Jesus isolates His disciples (as Israelites) saying such as, “*I say unto you*”, we should accept that He is not addressing non-Israelites.

We find that many of the stumbling blocks are based upon mis-understanding of “*all*”, “*all men*” “*whosoever*”, “*every*”, “*everyone*” and such words. Lexicons give much space in covering these words. In his coverage of “*all*” [Greek: *pas*] which is often translated in these various ways. Vine’s Expository Dictionary says:

Before proper names of countries, cities and nations, and before collective terms like Israel, it signifies either all or the whole, for example, Matt 2:3, Acts 2:36. Used with the article, it means the whole of one object. In the plural it signifies the totality of the persons or things referred to.

This totality only refers to that part which is the subject of the context. Thus all men [of Israel] cannot mean all of every race in the world.

Thayer confirms this [under ref 3956]:

The words "world" and "all" are used in some seven or eight senses in Scripture, and it is very rarely the "all" means all persons, taken individually.

The important point to note is that the “*all*” is recognised as not being a universal “*all*”. Its precise restriction is the purpose of this book. From a note from Josephus [Wars 2:19.1] we read:

Here we have an eminent example of that Jewish language, which Dr. Wall truly observes, we several times find used in the sacred writings; I mean where the words “all” or “whole multitude”, etc., are used for much the greatest part only, but not so as to include every person, without exception; In considering all similar objections listed, this must be taken into account.

13. PENTECOST

Acts 2:21 And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.

Here we have another “*whosoever*” and so we must determine to whom the “*whosoever* relates”. This whole chapter is exclusive to the people to whom the prophet Joel made his prophecy. This was made to Israel so how can any say it was made to others? If every prophecy is made to everyone then we have a grey mass and everything is likewise an obscure grey. Nothing is ever clear! What would be the point of prophets giving different messages to different people if all people were the same?

The “*whosoever*” relates only to those to whom it is spoken. Peter makes this very clear in verse 36, “*Let ALL THE HOUSE OF ISRAEL know that God ...*”. Who was he addressing? The “*whosoever*” and “*all*” is exclusive to that group. The “*whosoever*” and the “*all flesh*” cannot allude to anyone other than genetic Israelites.

At Pentecost some scattered Israelites came to Jerusalem from different countries. This does not say that they were from different races. Would they have come to the feast if they had been pagans or if they were following other cultural beliefs? Such would not even be permitted to enter the temple [Acts 21:28]. Yet this is said by churches to try to prove the generalisation that people of all races came to the feast. The bulk of the House of Israel had become scattered among other nations and the majority of these were to be reached later. The gospel was to be proclaimed which *began “from Galilee”* [Acts 10:37] and was “*published through all Judea*”. Jesus sent His disciples away to “*the lost sheep of the House of Israel*” and it is not unreasonable to suggest that some among those sought out attended the Feast of Pentecost. We read about Jews [Judeans] “*dwelling*” (*katoikeo*) in Jerusalem [Acts 2:5] and of others “*dwelling*” in other countries [Acts 2:9] attending Pentecost. To infer that nationality and race are always the same thing is far from honest! And, of course, the notion about the “*Church*” being a “*Gentile*” Church of non-Israelites following Pentecost is nonsense, simply because there were Jews there.

14. “GO INTO THE HIGHWAYS”

Matt 22:9 Go ye therefore into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage.

Again, the standard universalistic doctrine teaches this Scripture wrongly in an endeavour to say everyone of every race is included in this call. There is a lot more in these verses than meets the eye. The servants were told to go to the cross-roads [*diex*] but instead they went to the ways [*hodos*]. Both words are translated as cross-roads in the KJV. At the cross-roads there is a separation place, but on the ways, or the path between two places there is no separation place. The consequence of going to the wrong place to invite people to the wedding, was to bring in people who were an un-separated mixture of two kinds. In verse 11 there is a man “*not having on a wedding garment*”. This suggests that one group does not have on the wedding garments and the consequence is that the evil or the bad guests are to be cast into outer darkness.

Where do the churches go today to preach? Do they go to the “*hodos*” or to the “*diex*”? Should we be going to the lost sheep of the House of Israel as Jesus commanded His disciples? Should it not be with Israel to whom the New Testament is made? The New Testament still pertains to those who had the Old Testament and direct statements to the contrary cannot be found in Scripture. [Please read Jeremiah 31:31-34 to review the limitation given. The New Testament confirms this in Hebrews 8:8-9].

15. ALL MEN JUSTIFIED BY THE FREE GIFT

Romans 5:18 Therefore as by the offence of one, judgement came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.

Our prime consideration in this verse is the latter part because we are establishing the identity of these all men. In all this book of Romans, the subject people are of the seed of Abraham according to *the flesh* [Rom 4:1] and so this book is not written to any others than Israelites. The subject people are indicated as “*we*” in this chapter and these people are identified as being Israelites. If there is any hesitation in acceptance of this statement, the reader should obtain the book, “*The Exclusiveness of Israel*” and read the sections on the exclusive nature of Israel in the book of Romans. In Romans 4:16 we read, “*that the promise might be sure to all the Seed*”. It is not to all seeds on earth, but to that particular seed (*sperma*” being addressed.

A similar situation occurs in Romans 7:6 “*That we being delivered from the Law*”. The pronoun “*we*” only refers to those to whom the Law had been given and the Law was given to Israel only, as a covenant. Because of this, the “*all men*” in this verse is applicable only to the seed of Abraham through Isaac, and to nobody else

16. “WHO WILL HAVE ALL MEN TO BE SAVED ...”

1 Tim 2:4 Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.

The earlier notes on “*all*” and “*every*” apply here. That it does not mean a blanket every person on earth is obvious from the fact that all men are not saved. In the following verses there are the words “*who gave Himself a ransom for all*” ... and these words show that the “*all*” concerns only those who needed to be ransomed, that is, those who were under the Law which is exclusively Israel.

17. “BUT THAT ALL SHOULD COME TO REPENTANCE ...”

2 Peter 3:9 ... But is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any [that is, any of us] should perish, but that all should come to repentance.

Here we do not have the word “*men*” mentioned, but in its place we have the indefinite pronoun “*tis*” which denotes *some or any person or object ... any man ... whomsoever, or certain men etc ...* see Strong G5100. “*Certain men*” are not “*all men in general*”.

Thayer [5100] *It indicates that the thing with which it is connected belongs to a certain class, or resembles it.*

In this book Peter is writing to the one Holy Nation. He is writing to the strangers of his own blood. Peter again refers to “*our Fathers*” indicating that the people to whom it was written were the children of the Fathers, and so the “*any*” is racially exclusive. All men on Earth do not have “The Fathers” Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as their progenitors. In this passage Peter is pointing out

that God is long-suffering to “US-ward” and not to “THEM-ward”. Peter is writing to an Holy Nation. He is not writing to “The Church” as a multi-racial group.

18. “SALVATION TO ALL MEN”

Titus 2:11 For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men.

The “all men” in this passage is the same as that in the passage above. It is again limited by those to whom it is addressed, namely God’s elect [Titus 1:1], and in Titus 2:14 we can see that this again limits the scope of all men to those who were given the law ... “*who gave himself for US, that he might redeem US from all iniquity*”.

19. “THE KINGDOM NOW INCLUDES EVERYONE”.

Jesus told the disciples where told to go and proclaim “The Kingdom” and that the time was at hand. After His resurrection Jesus spoke to the Apostles about this Kingdom.

Acts 1:3 ... being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God.

This appears to be the initial message of Jesus and He taught it right up to His ascension. But who is willing to teach this today? We hear much about the gospel of universal salvation, but this is not what Jesus taught. Try to find the gospel of universal salvation in the Law, the Psalms, and the Prophets. Then try to find it in the New Testament as the fulfilment of the Old Testament. “The Church” might seem to be an answer, but the fulfilment still has to be “*in us their children*” - [Acts 13:32,33]. If this is so, then The Church still has to be racial; the members still have to be “*the children of The Fathers*” (of Israel).

The disciples asked Jesus before His ascension, Lord, “*wilt thou at this time restore the Kingdom TO ISRAEL*”? -[Acts 1:6]. Look again at this. To whom is the Kingdom to be restored? Is there ever a suggestion that any but genetic Israel will be included in that Kingdom? The meaning of the word “Israel” includes “ruling with God”. If Israel was made up from all the nations, then who are the other nations over which Israel is to rule with God? Jesus used the word ‘salvation’ only twice, but 78% of the gospels are about the Kingdom.

Consider these expressions:

The KING	Is the King of ISRAEL.
The REDEEMER	Is the Redeemer of ISRAEL.
The HOLY ONE	Is the Holy One of ISRAEL.
The FATHER	Is the Father of ISRAEL [“My Son”].

Look in vain for these titles to apply to other than Israel in the Bible.

20. “THERE ARE TWO ISRAELS: ONE NATURAL, ONE SPIRITUAL”.

To say that there is a natural Israel and a spiritual Israel is the only way out of the dilemma some people have in trying to fit their doctrines and prophecy together. Their dilemma arises from the wrong basic traditional teaching that:

[a] *The Jews are National Israel, [or “Natural Israel” or “God’s natural people”].*

[b] *The Gentiles are The Church, [or “Spiritual Israel” or “God’s heavenly people”].*

In a chapter of “*The Exclusiveness of Israel*” it is shown that “The Jews” are not Israel and that “Gentiles” may be Israelites. Obviously there are two groups of peoples concerned. There is no denying this. This is why it is so important to determine exactly who the two groups are. In the Old Testament there is no dispute about this. Israel separated into two Kingdoms which were basically:

[a]	The House of Israel [ten Tribes] known as Ephraim.
[b]	The House of Judah [two Tribes] ... known as Judah.

These two Houses had enmity between them, and according to prophecy, they retain this enmity until unity is restored under the New Testament that the two Houses receive nationally. The timing of the reunion is at the time of the re-gathering of both Houses of all Israel. Ephraim and Judah are unique identities, through Scripture from the time of the division of Israel into two

Kingdoms, until the re-gathering of Israel as a whole. Ephraim was and is the leader of the House of Israel-[ten tribes] whereas Judah was and is the leader of the House of Judah-[two tribes].

Isaiah 11:12-13. ...and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim.

Here in the Old Testament we find two groups within all Israel which stay two national groups until the time given to once again become one group. They are still the two groups to whom the New Testament was given.

Heb 8:8-9 Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; ...

There is no record in Scripture of the New Testament being made with any other two groups. This verse says that they are the same race with which God was involved in the Exodus from Egypt. Again we have definition in the words *their fathers*. This gives a racial statement of meaning that cannot be spiritualised. The problem that then arises is, that if the covenant people were to be spiritualised into two different groups, one Israelite and the other non-Israelite, then one of the original two national groups would have to have vanished or the two combined before the appointed time.

Despite the fact that this cannot be found in prophecy in the Old Testament, or in the New Testament as fulfilment of prophecy, the belief about Jews and non-Israel Gentiles is still taught as being truth. In order to accommodate all races, the other doctrine had to be created and this is actively promoted.

This non-scriptural doctrine pre-supposes that non-Israel races need salvation from a broken law that they were not given to break in the first place. This idea cannot be found as a doctrine in either Testament.

NOTE: No statement about the final destiny of non-Israel races has been made or suggested in this paper.

The idea about all races needing redemption comes mainly from the misuse of “all”, “whosoever” etc. in the New Testament. But there is no denial that the non-Israel nations should be made subject to the Law of Christ. Jesus will rule with a rod of iron, and the nations will bring their glory to the New Jerusalem, but we are told that the other nations ruled will be outside that City.

The extra-scriptural doctrine about “Jews and Gentiles” arises from interpretations of the books of Romans and Galatians. But, the racial statements cannot be eliminated from these books, even if it is thought God should have given the covenants to every race on Earth. The expressions, “The House of Israel”, and “The Twelve Tribes” still are found through the New Testament.

In concluding his argument about the so-called “Jews and Gentiles”, the Apostle Paul says:
*Rom 11:26 And so **all Israel** shall be saved; as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away un-godliness **from Jacob**.*

From whom? There is no mention about any but all Israel being saved. None other than the seed of Jacob are included in being turned from un-godliness. Other races can never be part of “all Israel” or “Jacob”.

Rom 3:30 Seeing that it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision by faith, and uncircumcision through faith.

Those whom God would justify are shown to be:

[a] The CircumcisionThe House of Judah....Basically two tribes.

[b] The Uncircumcision ... The House of Israel.....Basically ten tribes.

The House of Israel had become dispersed among the nations and were known as the un-circumcision. They had become as strangers and aliens to the Judeans, but they were still Israelites by race.

To the Judeans who had the temple worship, the House of Israel was unclean and was despised.

Rom 4:13 For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.

It is still to Abraham's seed through Isaac that the promises were made. This includes all from Jacob to Jesus who believed God. All Israel is saved by Jesus, but it is personal belief in what God says that saves the individual person within that seed. The popular doctrine says the seed is only a spiritual seed which can be made up from all races.

Rom 4:16 ... to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed.

Paul is not talking about other races. It is always to the one seed of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob. These are the children of promise. Prophetically the New Testament is made only with the two Houses, the House of Israel and the House of Judah. Hebrews 8:8 shows the promise of the New Testament concerns only these two Houses. This is the fulfilment of Jer 31:31. Paul sums up the two parties, and declares:

Rom 9:4 Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption.

All the objections in the world are not going to change what pertains to Israel or to the Word of the Lord. This verse says **Who ARE** Israelites. "Adoption" and "grafting in" only applies to Israelites.

22. THE LORD'S PRAYER

When we pray as Jesus taught, "*OUR Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy Name, THY KINGDOM come*", what are we saying?

Is the pronoun "*our*" referring to all races or to Israel?

Is God ever called the Father of races other than Israel?

Is Thy Kingdom ever other than the Kingdom over which the King of Israel will reign?

A close examination will indicate that the particular "Father" referred to is "*Our Father*", or "the One in The Heavens". It is not "*their*" father. Jesus said that the father of "The Jews" was the Devil- [John 8].

23. "THE ISRAEL OF GOD"- [Gal 6:16]

It is common to hear that the phrase, "*The Israel of God*" means The Church. This statement is used as a basis for sermons about universal salvation. It is so easy to make a wrong statement and then use that statement as a foundation. But being based on a wrong foundation, this doctrine cannot stand. The "Israel of God" means the Israel of the Supreme Divinity. It says nothing about God being the God of all the races. This book of Galatians is written to them *that were under the Law*, that is to Israel. There will be those who say that there is now a spiritual Israel as well as a natural Israel, as a way of promoting universal salvation. We have considered this above.

24. "STRANGERS CAN BECOME AS ISRAELITES".

It is claimed by many that the word "strangers" indicates other than Israelites. In the Book of Peter we find this Apostle to the circumcision writes to "*strangers scattered*" as also does James, in the first verse of his book. The "strangers scattered", contains the same word that is used in James, who addresses his book to the Twelve Tribes. Please look this up and make sure about this. So these strangers are still of the Twelve Tribes!

If any want to consider this matter further they can find that looking at the word "pilgrim" as used by Peter will help. This is exactly the same word that is translated as "stranger" in 1 Peter 1:1. The words, "*pilgrims and strangers*", also appear in Hebrews 11:13 which clearly isolates them as being Hebrews [that is, Israel]. A chapter of "*The Exclusiveness of Israel*" entitled *Pilgrims, Strangers and Israel* examines this in more detail.

This again is the language of the Old Testament where David says:

Psalm 39:12 ... for I am a stranger with thee, and a sojourner, as all my fathers were.

"My fathers" gives immediate racial identity. But, further to this, the Hebrew words used for "stranger" and "sojourner" are:

Ger meaning a stranger (an unknown person) of ones own blood, tribe, or race.

Toshav meaning only a pilgrim or a temporary resident, and one who has no rights OR KINSHIP in any way at all with the people of the land in which they have taken temporary residence.

In this Psalm, David is saying that he is a stranger away from his home with God and he has no kinship with any other race around him. Peter make this same distinction.

1 Peter 1:2 Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father

This word “elect” and “the elect nation”, are those whom God is saying that He “foreknew” in the Old Testament.

Rom 11:2 God has not cast away his people which he foreknew.

1 Peter 2:10 goes on to quote from Hosea, (which is a book dealing primarily with the ten-tribed House of Israel).

1 Peter 2:10 Which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy.

In Hosea and Peter, the phrase “not a people” refers to the same people and hence cannot be non-Israelite “Gentiles”. Peter would have had trouble in convincing the Judeans that they had become not a people at some past time.

25. “JESUS IS NOW THE KING OVER EVERYONE”.

Remember how God said that David would never want for a descendant upon his throne until Jesus came to take this throne?

Jer 33:17 For thus saith the Lord; David shall never want for a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel.

At the time of Jesus, the throne of the Kingdom of Judah and Solomon’s line had long gone from Judea. The throne must therefore be manifest somewhere else and within the ten tribes headed by Ephraim. The Epistles are in full accord with the Law, The Psalms and the Prophets. But they are not in accord with tradition!

The people to whom Peter was writing had a King [1 Peter 2:13 and 1 Peter 2:17]. This again confirms that these people were not the Judeans, although they were Israelites. The people addressed had a king they were to honour. Peter tells us who they were racially. The indicators are given in the expressions an “Holy [that is, set-apart] nation” and a “peculiar people”, as pointed out in the earlier.

26. “IN THEE SHALL ALL NATIONS BE BLESSED” -[And all the “families of the Earth” being blessed in Abraham]

The major source of error in these blessing passages is what we mean by certain words. Translations are not consistent in translating words which they may give as “earth” and “ground”, “countries” and “the land”, and also this mixup occurs with the words translated as “nations”, “families” and “kindreds”. Although an extensive technical Hebrew language exposition is beyond the scope of this paper, there are things that need to be pointed out.

Originally Abraham was told to go from his father’s house unto an “*eretz*” that God would show him. If “*eretz*” here is the whole Earth, then Abraham must have gone to another planet! Abraham was told all “*The ‘Earth’ which thou seest, I will give thee*”. Did he see the whole earth from where he was? He was told to arise and walk through the earth. Did he walk across the whole globe? So we have to ask if this ‘earth’ is the whole earth or the promised land. It is not all the “*eretz*” of all the races on earth. Abraham was told to get himself out of his present “earth” and to go to “THE earth”. There are many references that give confirmation of the meaning. “THE earth” does not mean the whole globe, but rather that portion belonging to the particular area or person under consideration.

Contrary to popular presentation, we must note that in Genesis 12:3, the 'them' in "*I will bless them*" is plural, whereas the 'him' in *I will curse him* is singular. The Hebrew allows for two possible translations of "be blessed", namely:

- 1 *may be blessed in, or by, association with thee, and*
- 2 *may bless themselves [as the RV footnote says].*

Some awkward questions could be posed here if it was to be taken that "all nations" had the meaning of "every race on earth":

1. If those who curse Abraham are cursed, how could those so cursed be part of all nations that were to be blessed?
2. Were the Egyptians blessed or cursed through Israel's presence during their captivity and also in the Exodus?
3. When the Children of Israel went into the Promised Land, they were told to exterminate all the Canaanite nations. Was not that an unusual way of blessing the Canaanites? After all, they were supposed to be part of all nations. Likewise Amalek was to be exterminated.
4. In Deut 23:6, God commanded Israel that they should not seek the peace or the prosperity of the Ammonites and the Moabites right up to the end of the age. Ezra 9:12 indicates similar treatment of the non-Israelites in the land. This is hardly a blessing on those nations, is it?
5. When The House of Judah was in captivity in Babylon, is there any evidence of Israel being a blessing to Babylon?
6. When the House of Israel was in captivity in Assyria, did this make the Assyrians blossom?
7. In prophecy why are all the forecasts concerning non-Israel nations always detailing them as being servants to Israel and for them to perish if they refuse this destiny? This is so right up to the end of the age.
8. The promise to Abraham was to "ALL" nations without any exceptions. "All" cannot include those who are cursed and those God says that He hates. Hence "all" means "all the nations of Israel".

Throughout Scripture, Israel was "*to dwell alone and shall not be reckoned among the nations*" [Num 23:9]. Prophecy sustains this separation until the end.

Daniel 7:27 And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve him.

Isaiah 60:12 For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.

Zech 14:16,17 And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which came up against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacle. And it shall be that whoso will not come up of all the families of the earth unto Jerusalem to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, even upon them shall be no rain.

Israel and Judah were scattered among all nations, but are these other nations to be blessed? Jeremiah does not agree.

Jer 30:11 ... though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet I will not make a full end of thee ...

Jeremiah repeats this in Jer 46:28, addressing this to Jacob.

In all these Scriptures we can see the unique place of Israel among the other nations. This continues after Jesus returns and Israel reigns with God over the other nations. Finally there will be no more death. What a blessing! The blessing is either given by this seed, or by the Act of God.

27 THE PROMISE AND "THY SEED" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Acts 3:25 Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall the kindreds of the earth be blessed.

Only Israelites are being addressed here! We can find references in Scripture to the families [plural] of Israel. "Kindreds" is *patriai* which all lexicons give as kindreds from one

ancestor. The Hebrew *mishpachah* supports 'family' 288 times and it is used of the subdivisions of Israel. The Tribes became national identities but were of one racial group from one ancestor. Israel is still an exclusive race existing as families or nations. It is unto these Jesus was sent.

Acts 3:26 *Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning every one of you from his iniquities.*

In context, "you" still is the Israelites being addressed.

Without continual recourse to the Old Testament origins, it is impossible to rightly interpret passages in the New Testament. Only by going back can we know what "*all nations*" means and only then find a doctrine that is 100% consistent.

Galatians 3:8 can no longer be allowed as an "out" for those preaching universal racial salvation. When we take Scripture as originally written in the Hebrew and Greek, we find that conflicts disappear.

We can understand that an exclusive Israel in the Old Testament remains an exclusive Israel in the New Testament. The promises are ever fulfilled in "*us their children*" and never in others. They are fulfilled in brethren of the same kin. The blessings of the Patriarchs [as given by Jacob in Genesis 48 and by Moses in Deut 33] for *the last days* still apply separately to each of that same group of peoples, who are being specified. These include the sons of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh. In Genesis 49 Jacob gives his prophecy about what will befall each individual Tribe of Israel, in the last days. These are limited, specific and definite. We cannot find prophecy for the application of the blessings given by the patriarchs as being applicable to all other races. This is why "*all nations*" is commonly taken wrongly today as meaning every race on earth. The statement of Romans 4:11, "*a father of all them that believe*" is only in the context of Israel.

For "*the last days*", Jacob gave his blessings to his children one by one [Genesis 49]. The blessings were to his seed only. They were not to other seeds. The New Testament is still made only with the House of Israel and the House of Judah [Heb 8:8]. The word "*children*" in Galatians 3:7 [the Children of Abraham] is *huios* which denotes kinship or physical offspring. [Note: This word is also used of animals, so it cannot refer to spiritual offspring in the way commonly taken!]

How can the Patriarchal blessings apply to all races? If they were all the same, what would be the point of separation? And, if they are for the "*last days*", why not accept this as a reality, rather than saying that some singular multi-racial church, that has nothing to do with these Twelve Tribes, is the recipient of these blessings?

As it has been pointed out, translators show what they believe in their translations. For instance, in Galatians 3:8 the words translated *heathen* and *nations* are identical. The translation as *heathen* gives an entirely different connotation to the verse. The nations whom God would justify by belief were not heathen, but were of Israel. The proof of this is that this is the fulfilment of the prophecy made by the Patriarchs. This is confirmed – "*by him are ye justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses*" ... These justified people must have first been under the Law of Moses, so they could only be Israelites. Most of this book of Galatians is written relating Law and Grace to the one people. The whole argument might be summed up by questioning whether or not they were going to remain under the schoolmaster or whether they were going to believe God as Abraham did. What they were to believe was that Jesus had redeemed Israel and that Jesus was the Son of God.

Ultimately, that which is reserved for Israel, namely redemption, salvation, resurrection to eternal life, belongs only to Israel. It is their inheritance from Abraham, according to the promise made by God to *the fathers* of Israel.

CONCLUSION

We can see that the churches today have a major problem in doctrine. This is simply through wrong teaching that has arisen through failure to base doctrine upon the same basis used by Jesus and the Apostles. The basis must ever be the Law, the Psalms and the Prophets.

The Law and the Word of God were given only to Israel among the nations. Because of the misuse of the word “all”, particularly within the New Testament, the presumption is made that the Law of Moses, together with the associated covenant with Israel, was given to every person of every race. In this way, “*all have sinned*” is taught forgetting the context statement “*whatsoever the Law saith, is said to them who are under the Law*” -[Rom 3:19].

Look at this quotation that is one of many that shows “all” in the reverse situation.

Deut 28:10 And all the people of the earth shall see that thou art called by the name of the Lord, and they shall be afraid of thee.

Here “*all the people of the earth*” does not include Israel! This same situation exists more often the other way around with “all” being Israelites. There is yet one more important impediment preventing people accepting an exclusive Israel.

This matter is addressed more fully in the writer’s booklet, “*That Unfortunate Word “Gentile”*”. The unity of the Scriptures is made or broken upon this transliterated Latin-originating word “Gentile”, and what that word actually means.

If we look at the words translated as “Gentile” in the KJV translation of the Bible and immediately something strange will be seen: From Hebrew, it is translated 374 times as nations, 143 times as *heathen*, 30 times as *gentile(s)* and 11 times as *people*. From Greek it is translated 64 times as *nations*, 5 times as *heathen*, 93 times as *Gentiles* and twice as *people*.

The word “Greeks” in the Greek is the word “*Hellen*” and is used thirty five times. But our translators have chosen to translate this word (wrongly) as “gentile”, particularly in the Book of Romans. *Ethnos* and *Hellen* are quite different words! Sometimes the justification is to say that the Greeks were not Jews and therefore they must be Gentiles. This is not translating; rather it is interpreting Scripture in the translations. There is neither rhyme nor reason for all these various translations and mis-translations, other than to perpetuate a belief!

The commonly accepted meaning of the word “gentile” immediately falls flat from the translation point of view alone. When we add the fact that the word in Hebrew is used also of Israel it falls even flatter! When we show the real meaning from the New Testament, it becomes so flat that it cannot be seen! The Hebrew and Greek words mean “nations” as races and peoples. They mean any group of a common origin, including Israel.

Let us look at some Old Testament Scriptures where the words *Gowy*, *Goi* or *Goyim* are used. If we apply the logic concerning Gentiles for these verse, we can see the ridiculous conclusions that could be reached. Remember that “*go*” and “*ethnos*” are used of Israel as well as of other races.

Gen 12:1,2 Now the Lord said unto Abram ... and I will make of thee a great nation.

Gen 17:5 ... a father of many nations have I made thee.

Did God make a great non-Israel “gentile” nation out of Abraham and did Abraham father many Gentiles? Was the great nation other than Israel?

Gen 25:23 And the Lord said unto her (Rebecca), Two nations are in thy womb.

Could Rebecca have what would become two non-Israel “gentiles” in her womb?

Gen 48:19 ... and his seed shall become a multitude of nations.

There is no evidence in Scripture that Ephraim would produce a lot of non-Israelites.

Gen 46:3 And he said, I am God, the God of thy father (Isaac) fear not to go down into Egypt; for I will there make of thee a great nation.

Could the sons of Jacob be non-Israel “gentiles”?

Jer 31:36 *If those ordinances [the sun and the moon] depart from before me, saith the Lord, then the seed of Israel shall also cease from being a nation before me for ever.*

As the word for “nation” is the same as that translated “Gentile”, we could equally read “*the seed of Israel shall not cease from being Gentiles before Me*”. We could even say Israel would not cease from being heathen! This is absurd!

When we consider the word “*ethnos*”, which is sometimes translated “gentiles” in the New Testament, we have another block of translations among which we could make transpositions. The consequences are equally absurd!

Luke 7:5 *For he loved our nation, and has built for us a synagogue.*

Would that section of Jewry be pleased if Centurion had built a synagogue for the so-called gentiles or the heathen? “Nation” is the word *ethnos*.

Luke 23:2 *We found this fellow perverting the nation,*

Would “The Jews” care so much if Jesus were perverting the “Gentiles”?

John 11:48 *The Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation.*

For the Romans to come to Judea and take away “our” Gentiles gets more than a little silly.

So we can see how transliterating one word is the major cause of objections to the exclusiveness of Israel, as consistently presented through Scripture.